PAST & PRESENT

a journal of scientific history

EARLY CHRISTIAN ORTHODOXY
John Morris

THE ORIGINS OF THE MEDIEVAL TOWN PATRICIATE
A. B. Hibbert

SCIENCE AND RELIGION IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND
S. F. Mason

COMMUNICATIONS
WILLIAM PERKINS
V. Kiernan
LLOYD GEORGE AND THE LABOUR MOVEMENT
W. S. Adams

UMBER 3 FEBRUARY 1953

PAST & PRESENT

Editorial Board :

R. R. BETTS
Masaryk Professor of Central European History, University of London

V. G. CHILDE
Professor of Prehistoric European Archaeology, University of London

M. H. DOBB
Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge

J. E. C. HILL
Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford

R. H. HILTON
Lecturer in History, University of Birmingham

A. H. M. JONES
Professor of Ancient History, University of Cambridge

D. B. QUINN
Professor of History, University College of Swansea

Editor :
John Morris
University College, London

Assistant Editor :
E. J. Hobsbawm
King's College, Cambridge

ADVISERS:

Professor C. Cahen *Strasbourg* Professor G. Lefebvre *Paris*
Professor D. Cantimori *Florence* Dr. J. V. Polišenský *Prague*
Professor R. M. Crawford *Melbourne* Professor M. Savelle, *Washington*
Dr. Abdul Haq *Karachi* H. Takahashi *Tokyo*

CONTENTS:

Early Christian Orthodoxy 1
The Origins of the Medieval Town Patriciate 15
Science and Religion in Seventeenth Century England 28
Communications : William Perkins 45
Lloyd George and the Labour Movement 55

The Editors are not responsible for the views of the contributors

Annual Subscription (two issues) 15/-; single copies 9/-.
From the Business Manager, 'Past and Present,' c/o Titus Wilson & Son, Ltd., 28, Highgate, Kendal.

Early Christian Orthodoxy

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION WAS THE PRODUCT OF THE MEN AND WOMEN who inhabited the Roman Empire. Though obvious, the truism needs restatement. The purpose of this article is to raise a few of the problems of why and how the Romans fashioned Christianity.

The word " Roman " is much abused. Two centuries before the birth of Christ, Roman citizens were those who lived in Rome and its immediate neighbourhood. In 80 B.C. they included all Italians. In 14 A.D. four-fifths of them were Italian, and most of the remainder inhabited the coastlands of the western Mediterranean. By 212 A.D. they included every free inhabitant of the Roman Empire, including Egyptians and Britons.

The great majority of the inhabitants of the empire were engaged in agriculture. Most of them were at all times tenants or peasants, in a greater or a less degree of subjection to powerful landlords, either private or corporate. Greek civilisation meant the dominance of towns, and three centuries before Christ Alexander and his successors had firmly planted the Greek urban way of life in the countries of the eastern Mediterranean. To be a Greek meant to be an educated man, or an inhabitant of a town that claimed a Greek culture and a Greek origin, whether it lay in India or Gaul. That way of life was old when Rome conquered the east and saw the conqueror as something of a barbarian. Rome covered the West with towns, for the most part in the first two centuries A.D. In the west urban civilisation was new, and specifically Roman. There was no earlier culture to resist Romanisation; yet the urban civilisation of the west was weaker. The economic heart of the empire lay in its eastern provinces.

In East and West, the function of the towns was to make and exchange things. How much the countryman got from the town needs a great deal more study than the problem has yet received, but there is no doubt that the town got much the best of the bargain, and that the peasant knew it. Urban industry rested on the small master craftsman, producing with the aid of a handful of assistants, slave or free; master and workmen were both aware of the superiority of the townsmen to the rustic; and the rustic recognised, if he resented, that superiority. The common civilisation of the towns was able to bind together the diversities of the innumerable separate regions of the countryside. Only the towns could welcome and develop a world-wide religion; and that is why the urban form of Christianity became its central stream.

The last centuries before Christ brought one great change to Italy, and, to a lesser degree, to the Italianised provinces — the growth of mass slavery in the countryside. Great *latifundia*, ranches or plantations, absorbed immense numbers of slaves and produced huge fortunes. In the towns too the wealthy acquired large *familiae* of domestic and craftsmen slaves.

In 31 B.C. Augustus established for the first time a stable government of the whole mediterranean world, capable of maintaining formal internal peace and preventing invasion, and of containing brigandage and overt lawlessness within. With that security slavery began to decline. By 100 A.D. great slave-run estates had largely given place to holdings sub-let to small tenants, the more prosperous of whom might employ one or two slaves, while slaves themselves might also be tenants. Slaves remained, predominantly as domestic servants and administrators. Slave converts to Christianity are to be found; but they are not prominent. They were a class declining in absolute numbers and in the part they played in society. It is the urban poor who figure most clearly in our sources.

The centuries of the Roman peace levelled out the economic and cultural differences among the peoples of the Empire. The great gulf that, in the days of Paul, stood between Italy and the provinces, between a Roman and a non-Roman, virtually disappeared; the sharp line that Roman lawyers drew between slave and free became blurred, so that as early as the early third century one of the greatest of them sighed ' It is hard to tell a free man from a slave ' (Paulus, *Digest*, 18,1,5). Its place was taken by the division of free men into two categories, the worthier (honestiores) and the lowly (tenuiores, humiliores). Roman experience also levelled the ideas and religions of the Empire. In the time of Paul the educated thought in terms of philosophy; the mass of the city populations embraced a variety of mystery cults whose ceremonies and liturgies have left a deep impress on the ritual of Christianity; the rural population adored a multitude of local deities whom the conscious efforts of the Roman state endeavoured, with but indifferent success, to indentify with the gods of the Pantheon. All classes paid their vows to a host of divine patrons, supervising every aspect of humar activity, whose heirs are Christian saints. While the world obeyed one central government many thinkers sought to construct universal theories of God and man out of the diverse experience of the past. In the long run, those which tried to syncretise and revive the old religions and philosophies failed. Christianity succeeded. There is scarcely a Christian thought or practice which has not an ancestry in the past of the Mediterranean; but Christianity itself was new and different, because its starting point was different.

The sources for the early history of Christianity are few but well

established. There is little doubt that the substance of the Acts of the Apostles was written near to the date with which its narrative closes. The story of the Acts vouches for the authenticity of the Pauline epistles. The epistles frequently refer to each other and to past events. The narrative deduced from these incidental allusions is the narrative of the Acts, with insignificant chronological difficulties. Most of the rest of the New Testament certainly belongs to the thirty years after Paul's death. The writings of the Fathers of the next half century can be dated for the most part to within a decade, and thereafter to within a year or two. It is otherwise with the Gospels. It is certain that they did not receive their present form before the years 120/140. What was and what was not contained within their various texts before that date is a matter still unclear.

The narrative of the Acts begins with the appearance of Christ to the disciples after the Crucifixion, traditionally in 29 A.D. The disciples were commanded to stay in Jerusalem until the promise of the Father. They asked " Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom of Israel?" and received the answer " It is not given to you to know the times and the seasons." They are not told, as was Pilate in John (19, 33ff), that ' My Kingdom is not of this world.' The author of the Acts says that (21,15) he was in Jerusalem about 58 A.D. The story that he gives is one believed in Jerusalem within thirty years of the event. It is the belief of Christians whose faith is the imminent restoration of a temporal independent Jewish state under Christian leadership. In this belief the Jewish Christians continued, headed, not by one of the disciples, but by the brother and after him by other relatives, of the Lord, descendants of the royal family of David. The Jews, alone among the subject peoples of the empire, retained a fierce consciousness of their national identity strong enough to provoke a sustained and formidable revolt of the whole people. In that national movement the Jewish Christian Church was caught up; it never recovered from the disaster of 70 A.D. and altogether perished in 135 A.D. The influence upon Christianity of centuries of Jewish experience, embodied in the Old Testament, was immense; the influence of the short lived Jewish Christian church was negligible, confined to its effect upon Paul, and upon the small group of other Christian trends which subsisted on the eastern frontiers of the empire.

A Jew, a Hellene and a Roman, Paul embodied more of the varied strains of the early Roman empire than any other contemporary known to us. When his father received Roman citizenship there were not many in the Levant who possessed citizenship. He must have been born to unusual wealth and political prominence. Cut off by his adhesion to Christianity from his class and background, he was driven to live among the poor and humble. His native city,

Tarsus, lay upon the frontier of the Syriac and the Hellenistic Asian world. Its university had long been the principal seminary of Hellenic culture among the educated of the Levant; when Paul was young it was at its height, surpassing, in the view of Strabo (14, 673), Athens and Alexandria, its heads having an intimate personal connection with Augustus. It is very probable that Paul studied at Tarsus, and certain that he was of student age while the imprint of Augustus was yet fresh upon the university.

Paul's first preaching was in Cyprus and in Antioch of Pisidia. The coastlands of Asia minor were studded with ancient Greek foundations, penetrating up the valleys, and ringing the pre-Greek Anatolian peasantry of the interior highlands. The numerous additional foundations of the Kings, among them Antioch, with a strong Jewish element centuries old, buttressed the Greek coast against the highlanders. Antioch Augustus chose as the chief among a series of Roman colonies, fronting both Greek and barbarian. The Augustan colony was half a century old when Paul first preached, proud of a vigorous Latinity which it alone maintained, an outpost in a Greco-Asian world. It was the only city east of Italy that had representatives in the imperial senate at Rome. There were two of them, and one, Sergius Paullus, happened to have drawn the lot for the proconsulate of Cyprus in the year in which Paul came to preach. It was a far reaching coincidence that the proconsul was the chief citizen of the eastern mediterranean, the only one among the hundred or more eligible candidates who had been brought up in the Greek lands and was equipped to understand the minds of the east. Paullus 'believed, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord' (13, 12). St. Paul, previously called Saul, may have taken his name; he certainly changed his plans, and made straight for Antioch of Pisidia, where he was at first well received. It is scarcely to be doubted that the change was due to the attitude of Sergius Paullus, and probable that Paul went armed with letters of introduction from him.

In Antioch, he preached first to the synagogue. The Jewish leaders opposed him, and used their influence with the municipal authorities to secure his explulsion as a seditious element. The converts were few but devoted, Jewish in the main, but including some gentiles. Thereafter Paul adhered to the policy begun at Antioch. The cities on which he concentrated were in the main Greek cities that had become Roman colonies, Alexandria Troas, Philippi, Corinth. In each case he at first received the support of a section of the leading men and women of the city, and later found their support grow cold; often imprisoned and scourged, the converts recorded were " not many mighty, not many noble " (I Cor. 1, 26); but they were inhabitants of the great Roman foundations in the eastern provinces.

It has long been customary to seek in the Pauline epistles an ethical and theological code designed for the conduct of Christians on earth, or alternatively to look for policy of social and political reform. It is doubtful if either search is legitimate. If he had been asked to outline either, Paul would have given the short answer that they were none of his business. Just as the disciples considered it their duty to remain in Jerusalem till the promise of the Father was fulfilled, so Paul believed that at the coming of the Lord ' we which are alive and remain shall be caught up ' (I Thess. 4, 15, 17). The end of the known world was really imminent, and every other consideration was subordinate to the impermanence of tangible reality. When, later, he made more precise what he understood by the coming of the Lord, he envisaged a total transformation of the material substance of the earth from natural, corruptible and mortal to spiritual, incorruptible and immortal. The conception is implicit in his later works, but is most clearly set out in the magnificent poetry of I Corinthians (15, 40 ff) and in Philippians (3, 21.)

Nevertheless, in the twenty-five years of Paul's activity, practical problems of what to do in the meantime occurred very frequently. His letters nowhere contain a programmatic statement of principles, but they abound with ad hoc answers to questions raised by the individuals and communities with whom he corresponded. Masters must treat slaves justly, and slaves obey their masters; man and wife are one, with equal rights, but the man is the head of the family; it is better to marry than burn; but above all, ' the time is short,' ' the fashion of this world passeth away ' (I Cor. 7, 29 ff) and these problems matter only in so far as they affect the zeal and devotion of the Christian and his prospects of salvation at the imminent advent of the Lord. The government must be obeyed, (Titus 3, 1; Romans 13, 1 ff) for it is ordained of God; but once again, " our salvation is nearer than we believed " and what really matters is to ' put on the Lord Jesus Chrst and make not provision for the flesh.'

In brief, human relationships depend on mutual love and self respect, on loving thy neighbour as thyself, in itself no new doctrine, though it was said in detail in a world where it needed saying. What was new was the insistence in practice on the equality of all men; ' there is neither Greek nor Jew, bond nor free, male nor female . . . Barbarian nor Scythian . . . but Christ is all and in all ' (Gal. 3, 38; Coloss. 3, 11) the words run counter to the theory and practice of established society, though they might find an ancestry in early Stoic thought. In practice, an association that realised such ideals in its day-to-day relationships was a potential revolutionary menace, thoroughly challenging the principles on which the ordered Roman world was built. Paul had worked for his own day, for a world which he believed would have no foreseeable future; he was

above all an organiser, an inspirer of other mens efforts. Yet just because the organisation he fashioned answered so closely to the needs and the possibilites of his own generation, it survived.

Pauline Christianity took its stand on a root and branch opposition to the established organisation of society; it looked to a cataclysmic revolution, one imminent and one based on the equality of all men. This uncompromising extremism of the earliest Greco-Roman Christianity was abundantly plain to the scholars of half a century ago, however different their political outlook. In 1893, Mommsen (*Expositor*, 4th series, Vol. VIII; *Gesammelte Schriften*, VI 542) wrote (in English):

> The mighty words " There is no difference between Jew and Greek, between slave and freeman " are the political and social negation of the established order . . . Christianity at this stage may be compared with republican opinion in a monarchical country . . . As long as imperial Rome continued its stay in the eternal city . . . it regarded the Chrisitan creed rightly as its slayer.'

A year later, Frederick Engels wrote (*Neue Zeit* XIII, cited by Kautsky *Origins of Chrisianity*, 497).

> The early history of Christianity has remarkable points of contact with the modern working class movement. Like it, Christianity was in origin a movement of the oppressed . . . Both preach an imminent release from servitude and misery . . . Both were persecuted . . . as enemies of the human race . . . of religion, of the family, of the social order . . . Ernest Renan said " If you want a picture of the first Christian communities, look at a local section of the International Workers' Association " . . . I would like to see a veteran of the International who could read, for example, the so-called second epistle to the Corinthians, without his old wounds breaking out.

The thorough hostility of the Christians to the established order is the key to its growth, its strength and its set backs, and to the troubles which it encountered on its triumph in the early fourth century. Though this view is no longer so widely held as it was in the late nineteenth century, the fault does not lie with the evidence.

The age of Nero and of Paul was an age of violence, decadence and uncertainty. A large measure of political power had rested in the hands of the nobility, the ancient arrogant aristocracy of the city of Rome. Economically and morally bankrupt, they were in the last stages of their decay. In 69 A.D. they were broken for ever. The new class to whom the triumph of Vespasian brought power were landed notables of Italy and of the Gaulish and Spanish coastlands who were now more Italian than the Italians. Despite a temporary check under Domitian (81-96 A.D.) they held power for a century and a quarter. In that period came the critical point in many of the great social changes outlined above.

At first, it was an age of moral and intellectual malaise; the bottom had dropped out of the world of the early Empire, and neither Greek nor Roman, senator, merchant nor poor man had yet found an accepted set of values to replace the ideals of the earlier age.

They found such values on the death of Domitian. For eighty years the senatorial aristocracy ruled unchallenged, through and with Emperors who respected its rights and desires. The standards of the age, at any rate in theory, bear comparison with those preached in Victorian England; sobriety, thrift, honesty, justice to the weak, were the watchwords of respectable society.

We know little enough of the social origins of the leaders of the Christians. Until 180 A.D. they were without exception Greek speaking. Where information is available, they were usually men of substance, unlike the bulk of the communities whom they served. History would have few problems if men regularly followed the political philosophies that directly serve their personal economic interests. We know nothing of what the composition of the Christian communities actually was; but we do know what its members thought of their composition. Throughout the century Christian writers are at pains to vindicate the thesis that the rare rich men among them can be good Christians; in a famous simile, written about 150 A.D., Hermas compares the rich to the barren elm, useless and unprofitable in itself, but able to support the fruitful vine who is the poor Christian. Half a century later Clement of Alexandria still had to justify the man of property in a pamphlet with the title ' What rich man can be saved ?,' and Irenaeus contrasted learned heretics with the unlettered orthodox (2, 39, 1, cf 2, 31). The attitude shows a Christian community whose ingrained habits of thought assumed that a Christian was a poor man, a rich Christian a contradiction in terms.

The first thirty years after Paul's death showed a steady and uneventful growth; unfortunately there is little certainty about the provenance of its treatises. In a class by itself stands the last great product of Jewish Christianity, the Apocalypse of John, a paean of burning hatred against the Roman state and all it stood for, gloating over the impending destruction of the city by fire, bewailed by the kings of the east and the merchants, foretelling the rule of the saints on earth for a thousand years before the creation of a new heaven and a new earth. Though Jewish Christianity perished the Apocalypse survived, and popular support forced its ultimate acceptance into the canon of the New Testament, against the determined opposition of the fourth century Bishops. It survived because it echoed those revolutionary yearnings which the counsels of Paul had discouraged; if Paul's counsels had not prevailed, it is doubtful if Christianity itself could have survived. But if the Apocalypse and its tradition had not stood forth on behalf of those revolutionaries, Christianity might have shrunk to a philosophy of the leisured class, an inoffensive neo-Stoicism. Characteristic of the tendencies of the Flavian period were the problems which beset the

writer of the Epistle of James; he had occasion to warn his readers against snobbery (2, 2); if a man with a gold ring came into their meeting, they were not to jump up and offer him the best seat. The ' gold ring ' is a technical term meaning a Roman *eques*, a member of the second echelon of the nobility, inferior to the senators alone. Evidently it was at least conceivable to the writer that such a man might take part in a Christian meeting. It is in fact just at this period that Eusebius claims two cousins of the Emperor Domitian as Christians. Modern scholars are fairly evenly divided between believing and disbelieving him.

In the meantime Christian churches of unknown origin had grown in many parts of the world. The church of Rome itself, founded by an unknown preacher before ever Peter or Paul reached the city, had grown so powerful that Ignatius of Antioch, sentenced to fight in the arena in Rome in 106/7, took it for granted that the brethren in Rome could easily use their influence and their money to secure his release, and devoted no little energy to imploring them not to do so. In Bithynia in 112 Pliny found an established and numerous Christian community, of whose existence no hint is found in any Christian source.

The first dissidents were the ' double-minded,' who doubted the reality of the long delayed second coming. Potentially more serious was the heresy of the Ebionites, who held that Christ was a mere man, a claim that would have denied the Christians all hope of resolving the problems of a developed urban society that seemed beyond mere human effort, practicable only for a God. Ebionism was however a local phenomenon of the Syrian desert regions, and never seriously disturbed the main body of the church. Far more dangerous was the opposite heresy, Docetism, which jibbed at the conception of a crucified God, early the target of pagan ridicule, expressed most vividly in the anti-Christian graffitos of the Domus Tiberiana on the Palatine, showing a donkey's head on a cross with an abusive caption. *Dokein* is Greek for to seem, and the Docetists held that the God only seemed to suffer, but did not do so in reality. Defeated, the heresy long survived in disguised forms, that Christ was ' adopted ' by God, to lose his divinity in the agony before death, or, in a later age, was formed of a different and inferior ' substance,' or ' nature.' The symbol of the God who became man and suffered the death that the law inflicted on a peasant or a slave was very dear to the mass of the early Christians, a stumbling block to the Gentiles. It remained the central tenet of Christian theology; it was in the struggle to preserve this concept against the attacks of the Ebionites and the Docetists that the conception of the dual nature, human and divine, first took shape, the embryo from which the concept of the Trinity developed during the second century.

A still more dangerous assault came from the Gnostics of Alexandria. In the main stream of classical and Hebrew thought, God is good and evil is the negation of good, the punishment which God permits to fall on the sinful, the reward of disobedience or folly, the chastening of the soul and the like. In that tradition man may always struggle with hope and confidence that God will not permit his faithful to fail. The contrary inversion of the doctrine, often invoked by Christian authorities, that suffering must be endured without protest as the will of God, has rarely deterred a serious rebel movement, convinced of its righteousness. But the tradition of the east, wherein Good and Evil are separate and contending forces, of independent existence, between whom the issue lies ever in doubt, teaches a pessimism and an individualism which has thwarted human progress, wherever it has prevailed. The Gnostics of the early second century contrasted the motionless Godhead with the evil creator God, the demiurge who created matter, from whose perversions Christ has offered to the elect a way of escape through the several spheres to reunion with the eternal Godhead. It is not surprising that Alexandrian Gnosticism appealed to those who could afford to pay a substantial initiation fee (Irenaeus 1, 1, 8) and developed the doctrine that the initiates were bound by no rules, and might do what they would with no fear of punishment in heaven or reproach on earth. In the simpler theology of the wealthy heretic Marcion, a merchant from the ancient Greek colony of Sinope on the coasts of the Euxine, the Demiurge became the wrathful God of the Old Testament, which he rejected from the Christian canon, together with much of Paul. From this premise, Marcion developed an ascetic contempt for matter, reminiscent of and indeed ancestral to the medieval Cathari, a legacy not yet extinct in European thought. The oriental concept of dualism fought hard and bitterly against the Classical and Hebrew concepts of a single Godhead; they were defeated only at the price of substantial concessions still plainly visible in the structure of Christian theology. But defeated they were. In the struggle against the heresies, the teachings of Paul were tested. By the end of the Antonine age Paulinism had conquered in all the decisive areas of the eastern Mediterranean. At the same time Christianity remained exclusively Greek-Roman but not yet Latin. Not till 180 is a single Latin Christian writing known. Even in Rome the known converts were almost without exception drawn from the Greek speaking section of the population.

More subtle than the heretical assaults from outside Greco-Roman Christianity were the divergent tendencies that remained within the limits of orthodoxy. In the half century from 130 to 180 a succession of university teachers published elaborate and elegant Apologiae

for Christianity, which tended to emphasise the Holy Spirit or Logos, at the expense of the human suffering, without however denying the divinity of Christ. Aristides, Justin, Athenagoras, the writer to Diognetus established the tradition. Their successor, Theophilus of Antioch, produced a lengthy Apologia for Christianity, which altogether avoided mentioning that God had a son, let alone that a Cruxifixion was involved; its appeal was limited to a demonstration that the Christian doctine was a logical fulfilment of the traditions of Greek philosophy, in lineal succession to Plato, Aristotle and Zeno.

These tendencies were the more dangerous to Christian theory in that contemporary thought was already developing a syncretism which explained all philosophies and religions as allegories and complements of one another. The urbane reasoning of Apuleius led him to the gentle worship of the Latin Isis, but in the hands of his successors, the Philostrati, Porphyry and Iamblichus, syncretist philosophy itself acquired the strength of a religion and became the most formidable rival of mature Christianity. To this nascent syncretism the Apologists offered a hand of friendship and sympathy.

Orthodoxy was the child of heresy. It took shape in the struggle against the heretics and passed the Apologists by. Its earliest defender was probably Barnabas, who probably dates to the early second century, earlier than the earliest Apology. Echoing Isaiah's cry for the cancellation of debts (ch. 3), he insisted that Christians attend meetings, instead of sitting at home, in view of the imminence of the Advent (ch. 4), which was delayed only until ' We have been made perfect ' (ch. 6). Taking over the conceptions of the second coming made popular by the Apocalypse, he understood a material Christian rule upon earth; in the meantime, his cardinal advice was ' Thou shalt not be like those who cannot get their food by their own toil and sweat, but live by exploiting, in their unrighteousness, the labour of others (ch. 10).

In Barnabas, the ' milk and honey ' associated with the Christian rule on earth was spiritual food. It was otherwise with the main stream of millenarist thought. The outstanding teachers of the early second century were Papias of Hierapolis and Polycarp of Smyrna. The last survivors of those who had known the apostles, their spiritual leadership was acknowledged by all Christians in the Pauline tradition. Papias preached the doctrine, which he ascribed to Philip the Evangelist, of a millenium after the Resurrection, in which the Christians would rule the earth. Eusebius, the great historian of the victorious church a century and half later, chides him (3, 39) as a stupid fellow who did not understand that Philip was talking in allegories. His stupidity misled a whole generation of the Fathers, and especially Irenaeus.

The writings of Papias have not been preserved. Those of

Irenaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, have for their main concern the refutation of the Gnostics. Citing Papias, and John as Papias' authority, he is forthright (5, 33, 3). In the millenium

> 'each vine shall . . . have ten thousand branches, each branch ten thousand twigs, each twig ten thousand shoots, each shoot ten thousand clusters, each cluster ten thousand grapes, and each grape shall produce twenty *metretes* of wine.'

Wheat, fruit, vegetables and livestock would be as productive. Irenaeus is not writing a fanciful and slipshod utopia. He introduces his description with a theoretical justification. (5, 32, 1).

> It is just that men should receive the recompense for their suffering in that creation in which they have suffered

And the principles of the Christian rule are based upon a rudimentary economic analysis, rare enough in any ancient writer. 'Unde Possessio?' he asks (4, 46), 'What is the origin of Property?', and replies 'Ex Mammona iniquitatis.' When we were Gentiles, we acquired our property either 'de avaritia' or from our relations, who had themselves acquired it unjustly. The problem is like that of the captivity of Israel in Egypt. If a free man is forcibly abducted and slaves for many years for another, so that he increases his substance, and then runs away with a small proportion of the great 'acquisitio' of wealth which his labour has created, it is not he who is to blame, but the unjust employer, whose wealth was gained through the labour of others. Christians however are proved righteous by devoting their ill gotten wealth to the poor brethren.

The Apologists and Barnabas are men of whom we know little but their writings. Irenaeus was a more important figure. Leader of the Christian community in Lyons, apparently centred on the staple of Asiatic merchants established within the Gallic town, he had succeeded as near as a man could to the paramount position vacated by the execution of Polycarp in 154. His great work became a text book, on publication, among all orthodox Christians, and was translated into Latin a few years later. Called in to mediate in the great dispute over the date of Easter between the Roman and the Asian Christians, his influence was decisive, and he also postponed for a generation the breach with the peasant Christianity of Montanus. Acknowledged as the most respected Christian teacher of his day, his millenarism bore the stamp of orthodoxy.

Irenaeus published his great work in or about 180, the year when Marcus Aurelius died. With his death, in the words of Dio Cassius (71, 36), a contemporary, the Roman 'age of gold turned to rusty iron.' A long war and a devasting plague brought into the open the conflicts within society. Army deserters seized several Gallic cities, whose gates the urban poor opened to them; dispersed by a punitive expedition, they attempted to capture Rome itself by surprise.

A succession of political and economic crises ended in civil war, and the old security was gone for ever. In the continuing civil wars of the next century the frontiers collapsed, and barbarians overran a great part of Asia Minor, the Balkans and Gaul. The generation which restored order and settled government also saw the triumph of the Christians.

The beginning of that period of insecurity brought a decisive influx of new recruits to the Christians, from the more well to do classes of the eastern provinces, from Africa, and thereafter from the rest of the Latin west. From the start Latin Christianity differed from eastern. Though it included poor men, it found an early welcome among the propertied classes. In Africa Tertullian's fellows owned land, businesses and slaves. He knows no problem of the poor Christian, the peasant or the slave. But his outlook was none the less intransigeant. His fiery energy denounced all compromise with idolatry, forbade to the Christian half the ordinary callings, school-teaching, jewellery, banking, and the like, praised the provocative act which courted martyrdom, and chastised those who sought a decent conformity. Tertullian found himself, not unnaturally, in a minority. But his fierce hostility to recognised authority lived on, and met a ready response a century later when Christianity spread to the Numidian countryside.

The generation of Irenaeus saw the first serious penetration of Christianity into the countryside. The Montanist movement in Phrygia, in central Asia Minor, was unshakably orthodox in theology. It differed from tradition in rejecting the authority of the urban communites and their bishops, modelled on the traditions of civil government. The supreme authority of the Montanist ' prophets,' who included several women, assisted by subordinate travelling Bishops, has some resemblances to the structure of the Celtic church, centuries later, based on a tribal peasantry. Montanism was the first of a series of peasant movements, whose schism lay in points of policy and organisation rather than of theology. Their influence was regional and could hardly have been otherwise. For unity still lay in the cities.

The problems of the third and fourth centuries are problems of a different order, concerned with the effects of the influx of large propertied elements into the church in the third century, and of the church triumphant in the fourth. These problems were fought out in terms of the achievements of the second century Pauline church. Without those achievements, without the traditions which the urban poor had gained in these earlier years, it would have been hard for the third and fourth centuries to fashion the church universal which made a single society of medieval Christendom.

The Christianity of the first two centuries was rooted in the poorer

classes of the towns of the eastern, Greek speaking provinces of the Roman Empire. Paul established his first Christian groups in those towns which had received the Roman franchise and were intended as focal points for the Romanisation of the east. From them he began to spread his gospel to the great Hellenistic cities. It was these cities, on the Ionian coast and up the valleys that lead to it, which produced the greatest teachers of the next century. The change was not accidental. The Roman foundations, Pisidian Antioch, Lystra, Alexandria Troas, Corinth and the like were either new foundations, or lesser places raised to a temporary prominence by their Roman status in the early Empire. During the second century the antogonism of Greek and Roman paled before a growing consciousness of a common Greco-Roman culture. As the antagonism waned the centre of Christian thought shifted to the old Greek cities of Aegean Asia Minor. Only the city of Rome itself held a position of comparable importance. The diffusion of Christianity matched, and indeed anticipated, the decisive change in the development of Roman culture, even though its outlook was alien and opposed to the ideals of that culture.

The Roman state imposed upon its inhabitants a considerable degree of political, economic, social and cultural unity, from above. The Christians built up from below a unity of belief, rooted in the main centres of Roman influence in the eastern Mediterranean. Every orthodox writer was fiercely conscious of the need for the unity of all Christians in the Church universal, however bitterly he might resist the claims of the Bishop of Rome or any other given centre to exercise the authority of that universal Church. Heretics and schismatics clung to local separatist beliefs and practices; unity and orthodoxy grew up together, forged in conflict with separate heterodoxies.

In so far as both sought unity, the state and the Christians fought the same battle. In so far as the state sought unity from above, and the church from below, they were in conflict. There were Christians enough in the second century, notably the Apologists, who saw the state's point of view, and had little sympathy with the popular basis of the movement. The story of the Christian church in the third and fourth centuries is very largely the story of how those who believed in direction from above came to control the Christians, and to find a concordat with the state. But they never overcame the fundamental theological conceptions which they inherited from the doctrines of Paul and Irenaeus; had they done so, the Church would have ceased to be a popular movement. Without that theology, the Christian religion which the cities of the eastern provinces produced could never been transplanted to the western Latin provinces.

That theology was born in conflict. Orthodoxy was defined, developed and steeled in the controversy against heterodoxy. Its

central tenet was the concept of the Trinity, the equality of the Father, the symbol of unity and power, of order and the hope of security; of the Son, the God who suffered death on earth, who was also the Logos, the heir of rational thought; and of the Spirit, or Wisdom, dear to the thought of educated Christians. Almost all heresies centred upon the concept of the Trinity, and most of them in one way or another sought to belittle the Crucified Son for the greater glory of the Father; they sprang from those who sought to lessen the gulf between Christian teaching and the tradition of the philosophers. Christianity became and long remained a universal faith of all nations and all classes within the orbit of Roman civilization, precisely because it refused such compromise, refused to jettison the popular basis which the first two centuries had won for it.

Suffering humanity longed for a different world on earth. Many rulers and many philosophies offered hope and promise, but revolution from above carried little conviction. Yet decisive social change was beyond the conscious organisation of common men. They were too scattered, their ways of life too diverse. Only a God could surmount such obstacles. Christianity alone preached a God who shared human suffering and claimed the power to end it, a God whose active agents were the poor and lowly, and whose promise was a total transformation of earth as well as heaven.

The earth was transformed. What we call the Middle Ages replaced the world we call Classical Antiquity. Serfdom replaced slavery. Imprecise as these difficult words are, few historians would be rash enough to deny a qualitative, revolutionary change in human relationships in the first four centures A.D. The men who made those changes also fashioned Christianity. As with the religious, so with the political, economic and social transformation, the mainspring of change is to be sought at the base of society, in the silent stubborn refusal of the ordinary man to go on being exploited in the old way. In 200 A.D. Christianity preached a new world that knew no compromise with the old, a city of God attainable and worth fighting for, superior to and hostile to the city of Man. Orthodox unity might achieve it where heterodoxy and separatism were impotent. In 500 A.D. the new world was Christian; it was a very different Christianity. The church triumphant was not millenarist. It belonged to the world of the rulers, not of the ruled. But it was never allowed to forget its humble origins. The ' humiliores ' of the Middle Ages knew that the founders of Christianity were persecuted, killed, destroyed by the princes of the earth, and yet had triumphed. They did not fail to draw the moral. Their thinkers inherited a reasoned faith and confidence in a better world worth striving for, which their forebears in Hellenistic and Roman society had altogether lacked.

University College, London. *John Morris.*

The Origins of the Medieval Town Patriciate

THIS ARTICLE IS CONCERNED WITH THE THEORY ADVANCED BY HENRI Pirenne to explain the origins and early history of medieval towns. This theory may be summarized as follows.[1] During the 9th and much of the 10th centuries long distance trade in Europe was at its lowest ebb, and during this period the only settlements which were not purely agricultural were the ecclesiastical, military and administrative centres which served the major needs of the feudal ruling classes: fortresses, monasteries, episcopal seats, royal residences and the like.[2] These had none of the characteristics of true towns and knew neither commercial nor industrial activity, but when long-distance trade revived in the 10th and 11th centuries the merchants and artisans produced by changing economic conditions settled round them. The influx of such people made it possible for true town life to develop.

From the very beginning the incoming traders differed from the older inhabitants. They were set apart by their origins, for they were "new men" and indeed outsiders to the feudal order itself, living on the margins of that society; they were set apart by their way of life for they lived exclusively by trade; they were set apart in a purely physical sense, for they lived outside the walls of the old feudal settlement or "pre-urban nucleus" in a separate trading and manufacturing colony, the suburb.

The feudal "core" of such double settlements remained static, inert, but the colony formed by the newcomers grew in numbers and in strength. Finally a time came when the traders and craftsmen felt themselves strong enough to challenge the control which the feudal element had hitherto exercised over them. They or their leaders struggled for independence, and by money or force of arms established a new regime which contrasted in all essentials with the old order. A distinctive social, economic and legal unit was brought into being, the medieval town, and this was the work of the merchants and artisans alone.

A group of the more important merchants commonly took the lead in the struggle to achieve these various changes, and after the town had thrown off or modified feudal control, this group developed into the characteristic medieval "patriciate." This patriciate was an increasingly narrow class which enjoyed social,

political and economic control in the town and whose power and influence rested on the control of the wholesale and long-distance trades of the town. The changing relations between this dominant element and the rest of the townsmen were to determine a great deal of later town history.

This theory is certainly both powerful and fertile, and yet it may be questioned at many points. What follows is not an original or exhaustive examination of the hypothesis. I intend merely to probe some of its weak points in a preliminary way. I shall only deal with one theme in detail, that of the origin of the patriciate, and shall choose my facts and arguments from among those likely to be familiar to students of the subject.

We can most profitably criticise Pirenne's views in two ways: on theoretical grounds and by reference to fact. In the first instance we may ask whether he was right in his view of the role of the revival of long distance trade in the 10th and 11th centuries, and in his views on the relationship between trade and feudal society in general. In the second, we may ask whether a sharply contrasted feudal " nucleus " and a trading suburb really occurred in the early stages of all towns and whether the patriciate really developed along the lines he suggested.

I shall make only the briefest reference to the effects and nature of the expansion of long-distance trade from the late 10th century onwards. Has long-distance trade as opposed to local trade any special virtue as a stimulant of town growth? Was long-distance trade before 1000 A.D. as unimportant as Pirenne's theory assumes? We may leave these questions aside, though Pirenne's answers to them may be, and have been challenged. There are other grounds for disquiet. Pirenne treats a trade revival as though it were something which happens of itself, independent of surrounding circumstance.[2] Such treatment of historical fact is often justifiable, it is a useful piece of shorthand to prevent an infinite regress from cause to cause but it loses its justification if instead of condensing argument to a convenient size, it involves the elimination of arguments vital to the discussion.

Just such a difficulty arises here. Pirenne's theory leans heavily on the idea that there is a natural incompatibility between arrangements of society suited to feudal lords and those suited to merchants and artisans, or between a " feudal " settlement and one allowing the development of trade and industry. One cannot deny that such an antagonism between " feudal " and " burgess " interests did develop later in the Middle Ages. It may even be granted that it was potential or latent from the beginning. If, however, we consider how trade *must* originally have developed in the context of a feudal society, and how the earlier concentrations of merchants

and artisans must equally have been the outcome of feudal circumstance, we may properly question any theory which assumes that the two were originally and inherently incompatible.

Both fact and theory suggest that in earlier medieval times trade was by no means a solvent of feudal society, but that it was a natural product of that society and that feudal rulers up to a point favoured its growth. There is the simple fact that whatever area and whatever century we may choose to take as being most typically " feudal " there is still trade and there are still merchants. Feudalism could never dispense with merchants. The very structure, technical level and economic habits of society always made some local and long-distance trade necessary. It is possible to press this point further. It can be argued that the development of feudal lordships and of related changes in agricultural organization both increased total productivity and concentrated the wealth so produced. Ever greater and wealthier feudal establishments appeared and these acted as ever greater and more demanding consumers — thus directly stimulating trade and concentrating those who supplied the goods for them. Again, a substantial class of merchants and craftsmen had to be fed by the agricultural labours of the other groups; these therefore had to provide extra food. It may thus be suggested that growth of such a class depended essentially on changes in rural society which made either for increased productivity or lower consumption per head among the tillers, thus providing more food. Such changes must have been wrought *within* the " feudal " structure and were a basic prerequisite of any town development.

The mass of evidence about what attitude feudal lords took in practice towards towns and trade adds weight to these arguments. They founded towns, encouraged merchant and artisan settlement, sketched out a staple policy in their attempts to direct trade through centres under their own control and, especially in Southern Europe, took an active and direct part in town life. There were two obvious reasons why they should do this. They had to provision large private and public establishments, and they wished to gain profit from trade and industry, either by becoming traders themselves or by tapping the wealth produced by trade and industry through levies and charges upon goods or upon those who produced and distributed them.

Portions of Pirenne's theory can be tested by a more direct appeal to facts. Two questions seem particularly prominent: the nature and role of the " pre-urban " or " feudal " nucleus and the origins of the patriciate. For the sake of brevity I shall discuss only the second of these here. Pirenne's description of the social history of the burgess class and the rise among them of an urban patriciate, is of prime importance in his theory. For him the

patricians were the main creators and moulders of urban life and institutions; they were the mainspring of town development. It is therefore of some consequence to establish who and what they were.

Pirenne answers this question in a fairly simple way. The more prosperous burgesses were the descendants of those newcomers who in the 11th century and onwards had settled round fortresses, monasteries and similar centres for the sake of security. Each had originally been " a little pedlar, a sailor, a boatman, a docker " or something of the sort.[4] Those who had prospered had become great merchants and from among the most notable of these was recruited, during the 12th and 13th centuries, the ruling clique of the towns, a patriciate whose class dominance was based on their position as great wholesale traders.[5]

Any attempt to find out whether the patriciate really did originate among merchants and " new men " encounters very great difficulties, above all the sheer lack of documentary material. The obvious way to answer the question would be to sample the family histories of members of the early patriciate, but in practice this is almost impossible. Of course this difficulty cuts both ways and Pirenne himself has to rely more on inference than on direct evidence for his own theory. The career of St. Godric of Finchale, which he uses as a picturesque illustration, is a rather shaky foundation on which to build a great theoretical edifice.[6]

The basic facts about many Italian towns are perhaps too well known to need much comment. There the petty nobility and the greater among the free landowners played a part which Pirenne himself admits to be different from that generally allotted to them in his theory.[7] They were favourably disposed towards the development of trade, they took a direct part in commercial activities and they were sometimes the most prominent subscribers of capital and the final controllers of commercial life.

At *Genoa* for example where the first trading partnerships are found in the documents of the early 11th century, the typical sleeping partner is a landowner who has some surplus capital to invest, presumably derived from land rents, loot from expeditions against the Moslems, or from feudal office. Later, during the course of the 11th and 12th centuries, it becomes even clearer that the greatest leaders of trade expansion were the men who already possessed influence and money because of their high position in a feudal society, men who received large revenues from rents or customs or market dues. In the very front rank, commercially as well as socially and politically, were great 12th century vice-comital families like the Burone, della Volta, Mallone and di Castro. They and people of the same general standing, such as the Embriaco family, dominated all aspects of Genoese life during this period.

Then, in the later 12th and 13th centuries, their position was challenged by new men who had risen from the lower ranks of society by the ladder of successful trade. Such newcomers were the Doria, Cigala and Lercari families who were to be so important in the period of Genoese maturity.[8]

This class of lesser nobles and landowners was equally importan in the constitutional development of Italian towns. They took a prominent part, and characteristically the lead, in the struggle against episcopal control. We find them to be the essential element of many of the earliest urban ruling groups; they provided the membership of the earliest Italian patriciates. From the earliest date *Milan* chose its consuls from the " capitanei," " valvassores " and " cives"[9] Elsewhere the " grandi " were typically recruited from the the lesser nobility and great landlords, from the group which had usurped seignorial control. This group was so little composed of great merchants alone that these latter had subsequently to lead revolutions to secure a share of control with the earlier patriciate. Long after the towns had achieved a marked degree of independence, in the 13th century, great merchants combined against the old patriciate of semi-feudal nature in revolutionary movements at *Florence* and elsewhere. Few things could be more significant, for if the patriciate had already been simply composed of great merchants such struggles would have been superfluous. Hence A. Sapori, summing up the present state of investigations into Italian town history, sees town development as due to the formation of a group stronger and richer than the rest, which usurped the public and financial functions of the overlord and gave its personal and class unity a territorial basis. It was essentially formed, he holds, of petty vassals, great emphyteutic tenants and large-scale " farmers," all of whom had developed a direct interest in trading matters.[10]

It therefore seems no exaggeration to say that in Italy the first stages of urban history in the Middle Ages were associated with the formation of a ruling group of largely aristocratic and feudal origin, which controlled town life and trading conditions. The later history of this patriciate would vary. Sometimes the original patriciate adapted itself to the changing volume and nature of trade by taking an interest in its development or by recruiting members from among the merchants themselves. In such cases an upper group, part feudal-aristocratic, part mercantile would arise, a group of mixed nature like the " magnates " of *Bologna* formed of nobles made *bourgeois* by business and *bourgeois* ennobled by city decree, both fused together in law.[11] In other towns the old patriciate would prove too unadaptable and powerful new groups would build up outside its ranks. Then the day would come when the controllers of the great trades either overthrew the rule of the " grandi " or else forced them to share their

powers. In the first case the history of the patriciate clearly consists, in various proportions, of the transformation of the old ruling group of feudal origin and the recruitment of new men into it. Even when events had the most revolutionary appearance, however, we have still to face two facts. An aristocratic patriciate held sway in the earlier and most formative period, and the supplanting group usually made little change in town organization and quickly formed itself into a body barely distinguishable from that which it had replaced.

Leaving aside the evidence of other southern regions, which is often so similar to the Italian, let us turn to northern Europe, for Pirenne in fact based his theory on the evidence of northern towns.

J. W. F. Hill has collected the information available about the families which dominated *Lincoln* immediately after it achieved some degree of self-government.[12] Take the three most prominent families of all, those which provided the first three mayors to be known by name. Adam, mayor between 1210 and 1216, had as grandfather a landowner and church benefactor, as uncles the holder of a fee and a bailiff of the lord; his father was a property owner, a man who leased houses to tradesmen, and supervisor of repairs to the castle gaol. His brothers-in-law were lords' bailiffs and considerable landowners within the city and in surrounding villages, his cousin another landowner. He himself possessed numerous lands, houses and rents, including land in the Bail, the area which remained under the feudal jurisdiction of the constable of the castle. His nephew, John Fleming de Holm, held a lordship at Langton as well as being an alderman of Lincoln, and John's son and grandson followed in his footsteps. The latter, Peter de Holm, held property within the Bail by homage and fealty to the Bishop of Durham, and his case is the first in which we *may* have evidence that the family engaged in trade: in 1268 he was granted life exemption from all tallages assessed in the city provided that he did not trade in the town. This seems very dubious and negative evidence on which to base a claim that the family was one of merchants. We must not make too much of an argument from silence, but it remains true that between 1150 and 1250 the family was one of important land-owners, rentiers and feudal officials, on the fringe of the nobility.

The second known mayor, William " nephew of Warner ", had relatives of the same generation who held the rectory of St. Paul in the Bail, held half a Knight's fee from the bishop, were owners of houses and market stalls, bailiffs and great landowners. William himself was bailiff to the lord on several occasions and a rich rentier into the bargain. There were trading interests in the family however; a certain Osbert, probably William's uncle, and owner of considerable landed property, was once fined for selling wine contrary to the

assize. Even so it is very arguable whether trade or land and office-holding ranked as the original and basic activity, and Osbert's sons and grandsons figured as prominently as bailiffs, landed proprietors and rent holders as they did as men with commercial interests. The third family, that of the mayor Peter de Ponte, conformed more closely to the pattern of the first. This family " had its roots in the Bail," contained two bailiffs in Peter's father's generation, and was characteristically made up of large landholders and rentiers in the 12th and early 13th centuries.

Naturally such evidence is not conclusive as to the origins of the 13th century patriciate of Lincoln. Somewhere in an unrecorded past these men *may* have first climbed to fortune by the profits of the Scandinavian trade. What the facts do tell us is that at its very first documented appearance the patriciate has the character of a land-owning and rentier group, holding feudal office and then town office without a break, merging with the smaller kind of feudal noble and landlord. If we can discriminate at all on such slender evidence we are shown that trading was at least as likely to be something taken up as time went on, as something to be dropped as part of a shameful family past.

Evidence of varied nature comes from other places. In *Poland* Rutkowski derives the trading patriciate of those towns whose population remained on the whole Polish, from the feudal nobles who settled in the towns while retaining their interests as great landholders.[13] In *Norway* the chief merchants in the 12th and 13th centuries were great ecclesiastics and great land-owners, while the ruling class of *Bergen* and its dominant trading clique before the days of Hanseatic hegemony, was made up of important officials and the principal owners of ' gaards ' (curtes) within the town, to whom were joined as more recent and less substantial elements, some professional merchants and shipowners.[14] Pirenne himself goes so far as to agree that in the 11th century there was at least some fusion between the knightly class and the upper rank of traders to form the patriciate in the northern towns, and he has also to admit that in some towns of his area, and especially in the episcopal cities of the *Rhineland* and the *Liége* region, the " ministeriales " of the lord entered into the patriciate.[15]

It is interesting that the evidence for his own theory is so very dubious in the one town on which Pirenne has published a detailed study — *Dinant*.[16] Here, under the presidency of the " villicus " of the bishop of Liege, the chief officials were the " monetarii " who acted as judges in the town court and were the instruments of episcopal control. Pirenne describes this feudal group as " gradually giving way before the slow but irresistible invasion of the bourgeoisie,"[17] the echevinage replacing the " monetarii " in the

12th and 13th centuries. Pirenne's case would be firmer if the " monetarii-judices " survived by the side of the " échevins " as a contrasted group. As it is, their disappearance allows us to guess that both groups might in fact have been recruited from the same class of men and that one was transformed into the other. In fact, the evidence suggests just this. In 1227 when the four " monetarii " are mentioned for the last time, two of them *were* " échevins," and another almost certainly belonged to a family which provided more than one " échevin " later in the century. In other words, three out of the four episcopal officials furnish direct proof of continuity and fusion with the echevinage. It should be noted that " échevins " were probably still elected by the bishop, that the law they administered was seigneurial, that they clung above all other things to competence in cases involving real estate. If the echevinage was the original form of the *bourgeois* patriciate as Pirenne says, then it must be conceded that it derived in great part, if not entirely from the same class as the original feudal officials. " Their possession in the city and its surrounds of vineyards, curtileges, houses and land rents " was a primary basis of their economic power and their large-scale trading interests were probably derivative.

J. Lestocquoy's researches into the great patrician families of *Arras*[18] provide most important direct evidence. He examines in detail five of the familes who were in the top rank from the 12th century onwards and in no case does he find their origins among landless new-comers or among a population of professional merchants some of whom gradually improved their position. Instead they seem to spring from a group who were feudal officials and moderately important landowners in the 11th century. The Crespin family, which produced some of the greatest financiers of the Middle Ages and lent several times their annual income to most of the cities of Flanders, first appeared as modest landed proprietors and possessors of a mill in the mid-12th century. They took up money-lending on a moderate scale about the 1220s. The Huquedieu family started in the service of St. Vaast monastery, as officials of the Count of Flanders and as cathedral canons about the same time. They may have had a military origin, and seem to have been high feudal officials; one of them was an échevin in 1111 when these officers receive their first mention.

Similar cases can be multiplied. At *Cambridge* we find that the alderman of the Gild Merchant and perhaps the first mayor of the town, Hervey Dunning, held land in half-a-dozen villages, claimed the rank of knight and twice demanded wagers of battle in suits concerning landed property. His father, uncle and grandfather were all landowners.[19] At *Brussels* the patriciate dominated the Gild Merchant at the beginning of the 14th century and contained

the most prominent merchant-employers in the drapery industry; yet no 13th century document shows the patrician " lignages " engaged in trade. Of course this is in part due to the chances of documentary survival, yet the further back patrician family histories are pushed, the more clearly the patricians appear as landholders and lesser feudatories. Families like the Clutines and Eggluys were farmers of tithes, tenants of castellanies, holders of ducal fiefs — they owed their wealth to lands, rents and the farming of feudal revenues.[20]

Perhaps there is much more similar evidence to be found. Who were the 11th and early 12th century aldermen of *London*? Who were the " possessores " who lived near *Ghent* in the 11th century and took their wool to the town to be woven? Who were the leading citizens of early *Douai*, two of whom can be found in the 12th century selling their share in the town tolls to the Abbey of Andin?[21] The whole problem of patrician origins requires much more detailed investigation, but the evidence does seem to call for an interim revision of Pirenne's theory.

This revision must take account of two main facts: the evidence which shows that old-established families could adapt themselves to new economic conditions, and use their old power to achieve power in a new context; and the truth in Pirenne's contention that the more successful merchants among the newcomers to a town could make their way into the ruling class. Two processes are involved in the formation of the patriciate, the internal transformation of an old dominant class and the recruitment of new families from the more successful merchants and artisans, who were often immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. Let us take each process in turn.

In the earlier stages of town development there was often a class between the actual lords on the one hand, and agricultural workers, craftsmen, petty traders, porters, innkeepers and the like, on the other. This group comprised large freeholders and emphyteutic tenants, sometimes the lower grades of the nobility (especially in Italy), prominent officials in the service of a lay or ecclesiastical lord, like the more important among the " ministeriales " in Germany, and, possibly, such elements as burhthegns, cnihts, lawmen, or members of a witan, dimly discernible in early English towns. The economic position of the group was intimately associated with the possession of land and feudal office. At the same time its members were willing to take advantage of any opportunity to improve their position — by leasing their land or renting the buildings they had constructed on it, by letting out stalls in the market place, by farming mints, tolls or mills from the lord, by raising loans wherever required, and by engaging their capital in commercial and industrial enterprises beyond the scope of lesser men.

Two things would happen to such a group, made up of quite wealthy men, used to freedom and possessing initiative, men accustomed also to running the affairs of the town on the lord's behalf, or at least to being consulted by him. What more natural than that they should be in the lead of movements for freedom from seigneurial control? The new municipal powers created economic and political opportunities of which they were in the best position to take advanatage. Psychologically, socially and politically they were in the most suitable position to conduct a successful attack.

Secondly, these men would probably have had an interest in trade from the earliest times. As seigneurial officials many of them were well placed for controlling supplies to one of the best of the early markets, the feudal households, and the group as a whole possessed land and land rents, one of the greatest potential sources of liquid capital during the Middle Ages. They would therefore include the capitalization of trade among their varied activities, and where trade developed quickly they might be merchant capitalists among other things at a very early date. As M. Postan comments: " It can well be doubted whether the conventional picture of a vagrant trader, travelling with his goods . . . ever represented the upper strata of the medieval merchant class."[22] At first, however, trading, if present at all, would not normally be the greatest or most typical of their economic activities; but as economic change proceeded in Europe, trade and finance would come to rival, perhaps to overshadow, other means of gaining wealth. The leading families, or the more adaptable among them, invested proportionately more in the new activities, because men of their group characteristically seized all opportunities of advancement of any kind. They would retain, and even intensify their old land-owning and office-holding interests by means of the new wealth, as methods of social and financial investment. By and large, however, the influence and power of the class increasingly depended on commerce and finance.

Thus the formation of the 12th and 13th century patriciate involved *internal transformation* of a dominant class which already existed, and which was opportunist enough to shift the emphasis of its activities as conditions changed. Some of the leading townsfolk were, however, too conservative and rigid in outlook to adapt themselves. They were left as survivals of an older stage, like the " grandi " in Italy, opposing the great trades rather than merging with them; or like the échevins in some towns of the *Liége* group who refused to join their more progressive fellows in leadership of the new council of jurés; or like the Avvocato and Gavi families of 12th century *Genoa* who failed to join the rush of many of their social equals into trade. Sometimes the class as a whole failed in adaptability, especially when it was faced with fundamental economic changes like those

of the late 13th and 14th centuries. Then there were challenges of varying seriousness, and the ensuing battles filled much of town history in the later Middle Ages.

These problems cannot be treated here. Instead we must complete the explanation of patrician origins by looking at the recruitment of new men. Outsiders, and especially those merchants and artisans who had made more than a modest competence through their ability and good fortune, could and did enter the patriciate. Such recruitment could take two principal forms. There was the normal continuous inflow of rich parvenus into the ruling group, which was all the more easily assimilated when the patriciate itself had developed large trading interests. The rate of recruitment however would vary greatly and depended particularly on the attitude of the patricians themselves. This suggests the second form. If the ruling group proved unadaptable and exclusive, a class of nouveaux riches was likely to build up in opposition to them, particularly when economic conditions had opened up new ways of obtaining wealth. Recruitment was, so to speak, dammed back, and would therefore produce tensions and greater or lesser crises in which the new men would try to seize power or at least to share it with the old.

A satisfactory explanation of the origin of the medieval patriciate seems possible along these lines. Moreover, the explanation can be adjusted to suit the divergent circumstances of different towns and regions by allowing for variations in the relative importance of the two main processes, the internal transformation of a " feudal " upper class and the recruitment of the new men.

Sometimes for instance the social constitution of an early town did not favour any large number of men of the " feudal " type. This type seems to have been especially common in Southern Europe, and particularly where there was substantial continuity of town life from late Roman times. It was fairly common in most of the episcopal centres and other large and old-established settlements in the North. But the old " feudal " group might be weaker, and the association of the " new " merchants coming up from below the stronger, for many social reasons. Then " recruitment " would be a major factor and merchants rising from among the commons more important than an element of officials and landowners who had taken to trade. In the South such conditions may have obtained exceptionally, as in *Venice*, but in the non-episcopal towns of the North they were much more common, especially in England and " new " Germany, where they were often associated with the peculiar importance of the merchant gild. It is on such evidence that Pirenne founds his theory, on part of the evidence for part of Europe. We may freely admit that in certain cases his explanation seems close to the truth, but what matters is that the explanation, appropriate

to cases at one end of the spectrum, is applied to the whole range. In fact even those examples best suited to Pirenne's theory usually show some small effects due to another type of development. Even in the North of Europe there are many important towns in which "transformation" was at least as important as "recruitment," and most towns in the South require a different approach altogether. Further, if there is a Pirennian extreme at one end of the scale, there seems to be an equally "feudal" extreme at the other. This is constituted by such towns as those in northern Italy and especially in *Piedmont* where communes sprang from seigneurial families whose multiplying offspring formed themselves into an association, each the nucleus of a town commune.

We may in conclusion note a few auxiliary advantages of the foregoing explanation. Trade revival and economic change generally are retained as integral parts of the scheme of development, and merchant capitalists keep an important role though a different one from that postulated by Pirenne. The explanation tallies well with that what we know of the forms of economic and political power actually exercised by established patriciates. It allows for a source of mercantile capital additional to or alternative to the windfalls of petty pedlars and porters. Finally it will allow for the idea that novel techniques or fresh markets might first be exploited by new men who in order to expand relied on association with wealthy men of older standing so that capital was gradually shifted from an older to a new use.

King's College, Cambridge. *A. B. Hibbert.*

NOTES

[1] H. Pirenne's theory was first advanced in articles on "L'Origine des Constitutions Urbaines au Moyen Age" in the *Revue Historique* 1895, and expanded in various later works. All these can be most conveniently consulted in the collection of his writings on urban history published as "*Les Villes et les Institutions Urbaines*" (2 vols), henceforward quoted as V.I.U.

[2] The word "feudal" will be used in this article to refer to a kind of society in which economic and political power derive from large-scale landholding, and where there is direct and indirect exploitation of this land by means of dependent cultivators.

[3] "Que l'origine des villes du Moyen Age se rattache directement, comme un effet à la cause, à la renaissance commerciale . . . c'est ce dont il est impossible de douter" V.I.U. I p. 376. "L'idée fondamentale . . . qui voit dans le commerce la cause essentielle de la formation des villes, est incontestablement vraie." Ibid. II p. 259.

[4] H. Pirenne, *Economic and Social History of Medieval Europe*, p. 48.

[5] Ibid. p. 201.

[6] Ibid. p. 47.

[7] Ibid. p. 48.

[8] Y. Renouard, *Les Hommes d'Affaires Italiens*, pp. 24, 47-54.

[9] V.I.U., p. 400.

[10] A. Sapori, article in *International Historical Congress* 1950, vol. I, Rapports.

[11] Ibid.

[12] J. W. F. Hill, *Medieval Lincoln*, Appendix V.

[13] J. Rutkowski, *Histoire Economique de la Pologne avant les Partages*, p. 39.

[14] J. A. Gade, *The Hanseatic Control of Norwegian Commerce*, pp. 27-8.

[15] V.I.U. I pp. 54, 103-4, 216.

[16] *Histoire de la Constitution de la Ville de Dinant au Moyen Age*; V.I.U. II p. 1-94.

[17] J. Lestocquoy, *Les Dynasties Bourgeoises d'Arras du XIe au XVe Siècle.* Since writing this article, I have been able to see Lestocquoy's *Les Villes de Flandre et d'Italie sous le gouvernement des patriciens XIe-XVe siècles*), which attacks the Pirenne thesis in greater detail along lines similar to those here indicated.

[18] H. Cam, *Liberties and Communities of Medieval England*, pp. 23-4.

[19] Favresse, *Le Régime Démocratique à Bruxelles*, pp. 32-3.

[20] V.I.U. I, p. 137 n. 1; G. Espinas, *Douai* I, p. 306.

[21] Power and Postan, *English Trade in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 146.

Science and Religion in 17th Century England

THE GROWTH OF A SCIENTIFIC MOVEMENT IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND has been ascribed to a variety of factors.[1] The most important of these, susceptible to historical analysis, were the economic stimulus afforded by new technical problems encountered in the fields of industry, navigation, and war,[2] and the religious drive of the Puritans towards the performance of 'good works,' amongst which were included the useful applications of science.[3] However, such factors, being essentially of a practical character, account satisfactorily only for the particular sciences opened up during the 16th and 17th centuries, notably magnetism, mechanics, and astronomy, but not for the structure and the pattern of the new theories, such as the heliocentric system of the world, or the theory of the circulation of the blood. Different forces were at work shaping the new theories of the early modern sciences, namely the ideological movements of the 16th and 17th centuries, of which the theology of Calvin and his followers was perhaps the most important in England. The elements common to the new theology and the new science were not perceived for some time. The medieval view of the world had been composed of a theology and a natural philosophy that were closely integrated. It was overthrown only in a piecemeal fashion, on the one hand by the Protestant Reformers who attacked the theological aspects, and on the other by the scientists who controverted the cosmological features. However it is possible to discern that the criticisms of the Calvinists and of the scientists proceeded along lines which bore some similarity one to the other, and the congruence between them was recognised in England during the second quarter of the 17th century. Such an eventuality is perhaps to be expected, since both Calvinism and early modern science, separately, have been connected with that single, but many-sided, social movement, the rise of capitalism.

At first scientific activity in England centred largely round the new navigational problems met by the geographical explorers, and the traditional problems of keeping accounts, calendar making, surveying, and military engineering which had come down from the civilisations of antiquity. Science, in fact, was closely connected with mercantile enterprise throughout the 16th century. The mathematicians, Robert Recorde, c. 1510-58, and John Dee, 1527-

1606, for example, were technical advisors to the Muscovy Company and the Cathay Voyagers, whilst merchants promoted science through the sponsoring of mathematical lectureships and the translation of scientific works.[4] Most important in this connection was Gresham College, set up in 1597 by the Company of Mercers and the Mayor and Aldermen of London with money and property bequeathed by the Elizabethan financier, Sir Thomas Gresham, 1519-79. In his will Gresham had specified that three of the seven chairs at the College should be devoted to scientific subjects, and he had laid it down that the astronomy professor in particular should devote a considerable proportion of his time to the teaching of navigational science.[5]

Gresham College was the main centre of scientific activity in England during the first half of the 17th century, English science still being connected primarily with navigational and other mercantile problems. The first Gresham professor of geometry, Henry Briggs, 1556-1630, was himself a member of the Virginia Company, and he and his colleagues, and their immediate successors, were associated with a group of ship-wrights and navigators who met at the house of John Wells and his son, the Keepers of H.M. Naval Stores at Deptford during the first half of the 17th century.[6] However, during this period industrial and ideological problems came to interest English scientists more and more, a trend which became conspicuous first in the *De Magnete* (1600) of William Gilbert of Colchester, physician to Elizabeth I. Gilbert devoted one tenth of his work to cosmological theory, and another tenth to the mining, smelting, and fashioning of iron, whilst a quarter of the book was taken up with navigation and nautical instruments, and just over a half with his work on magnetism.[7] After Gilbert, Francis Bacon stressed even more the value of science for the advancement of industry and the building up of a new world view,[8] notably in his *Novum Organon* (1620).

During the same period English science became associated to an increasing degree with the Puritan movement.[9] The Gresham professor of astronomy, Henry Gellibrand, 1597-1637, was arrested in 1631 for bringing out an almanac which omitted the list of Catholic saints and martyrs usually included in such works, and his successor, Samuel Foster, d. 1652, was ejected from his chair for refusing to kneel at the communion table.[10] With the events leading to the outbreak of the Civil War, Foster was reinstated, and Gresham College became the meeting place of a group of scientists terming themselves the ' Philosophical College,' an organisation which was the immediate precursor of the Royal Society. Besides Foster, the ' College ' included the Gresham professor of medicine, Jonathan Goddard, 1617-75, who was Cromwell's physician, and a mathe-

matician, John Wallis, 1616-1703, who decoded Royalist ciphers during the Civil War, whilst the leader of the group was the Puritan divine, John Wilkins, 1614-72, who later became Cromwell's brother-in-law, and who at the time was chaplain to the Prince Elector of the Palatinate, then the candidate of the Parliamentary party for the English throne. Wilkins did much to promote the application, dissemination, and organisation of science in mid-17th century England, advocating in 1648 the study of mechanics ' for such gentlemen as employ their estates in those chargeable adventures of Drayning Mines, Cole-pits, etc.'[11] He gathered round him an important group of science students when he was intruded into Oxford by the Commonwealth in 1649, and became the first secretary to the Royal Society at its foundation in 1660.[12] Wilkins was also one of the first to perceive the congruity between Calvinist theology and the new theories of modern science, a relationship which he endeavoured to consolidate and make explicit.

The *leit-motif* of the medieval view of the world, to which both the Reformers and the early modern scientists had taken exception, was the concept of hierarchy. This concept was rooted in the idea that the world was peopled by a graded chain of beings, stretching down from the Deity in the Empyrean heaven at the periphery of the Universe, through the hierarchies of angelic beings inhabiting the nine heavenly spheres concentric with the earth, to the ranks of men, animals, and plants, of the base terrestial sphere at the centre of the cosmic system.[13] A sharp qualitative distinction was drawn between the entities of the terrestial and celestial domains of the universe. In particular, the natural motions of bodies composed of the four terrestial elements were rectilinear, such motions having a beginning and an end like all terrestial phenomena, whilst the natural motions of the heavenly bodies, which were composed of a more perfect fifth element, were circular, as motion in a circle was noble and eternal. According to the ancient mechanics, the constant action of a moving force was required to keep a body in motion, and an important integration of ancient natural philosophy with early Christian theology had taken place through the identification of the movers of the heavenly bodies with the angelic beings mentioned in the Scriptures. Pseudo-Dionysius in the 5th century had arranged these angelic beings into a hierarchy of nine orders,[14] and it was generally accepted by the medieval schoolmen that these orders were the motors of the nine heavenly spheres.[15] In such a view of the world, the government of the universe was thought to be such that a given creature had dominion over the others below it in the scale of beings, whilst it served those above it in the scale.[16]

The Calvinists in theology and the astronomers in science reacted against this conception that the universe was hierarchically ordered.

Pseudo-Dionysius, by means of his celestial hierarchy of angelic beings, had justified the existence of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Church government on earth, an organisation to which Calvin took the strongest exception.

> ' To the government thus constituted,' wrote Calvin, ' some gave the name of Hierarchy, — a name in my opinion improper, certainly one not used by Scripture. For the Holy Spirit designed to provide that no one should dream of primacy or domination in regard to the government of the Church.'[17]

To the justifications offered by Pseudo-Dionysius Calvin replied that there was no ' ground for subtle philosophical comparisons between the celestial and earthly hierarchy,'[18] and he averred that man could not know whether the angelic beings were ordered by rank or not.[19] In formulating a positive point of view on these matters, Calvin tended to minimise the role of the angelic beings in the government of the universe and to assign to the Deity a more absolute and direct control over His creatures. Speaking of the relation between God and the angelic beings, Calvin affirmed:—

> ' Whenever He pleases, He passes them by and performs His own work by a single nod; so far are they from relieving Him of any difficulty.'[20]

Not only did the Deity govern the universe more directly, but also, according to Calvin, He had predetermined all events from the beginning.

> ' We hold,' wrote Calvin, ' that God is the disposer and ruler of all things, — that from the remotest eternity, according to His own wisdom, He decreed what He was to do, and now, by His power, executes what He has decreed. Hence we maintain that, by His Providence, not heaven and earth and inanimate creatures only, but also the counsels and wills of men, are so governed as to move exactly in the course which he has destined.'[21]

Thus the workings of the Calvinist universe were orderly and fully predeterminate. As the Puritan theologian, John Preston, 1587-1628, put it;— ' God alters no law of Nature.'[22] Miraculous happenings contravening the laws of nature were no longer to be expected, whilst the angelic beings lost their power, and ultimately their place, in the cosmic scheme. Such a development was regretted by some Protestants, but they admitted that it was the case. The Presbyterian, Richard Baxter, 1615-91, remarked in a work published during the last year of his life :—

> ' It is a doleful instance of the effect of a perverse kind of opposition to Popery, and a running from one extream to another, to note how little sense most Protestants shew of the great benefits that we receive by Angels: How seldom we hear them in publick or private give thanks to God for their ministry and helps, and more seldom, pray for it ?'[23]

Baxter himself confessed that he had not come across many instances of the ministry of angelic beings: most of the stories he related were concerned with the activities of evil spirits. However, it seems that even the evil spiritual beings had disappeared from

educated English opinion by this time, for John Aubrey, 1626-97, tells us:—

> ' When I was a child, and so before the civill warres, the fashion was for old women and maydes to tell fabulous stories night-times, and of sprights and walking of ghosts. This was derived down from mother to daughter, etc, from the monkish balance, which upheld the holy Church: for the divines say ' Deny spirits and you are an atheist.' When the warres came, and with them liberty of conscience and liberty of inquistion, the phantomes vanish.'[24]

Some doubts concerning the existence of spiritual beings appear to have been raised before the Civil Wars, for Thomas Browne, 1605-82, writing about 1635, remarked that it was a riddle to him ' how many learned heads should so far forget their metaphysics, and destroy the ladder and scale of creatures, as to question the existence of spirits.'[25]

The removal of the angelic beings from the government of the universe in Calvinist theology was indeed a criticism of the idea that the universe was peopled by a graded scale of creatures, or rather it was a criticism of the concept of hierarchy which was the kernel of the idea. The Deity no longer ruled the universe by delegating His powers to a hierarchy of spiritual beings, each with a degree of authority which decreased as the scale was descended, but now He governed directly as an Absolute Power by means of decrees decided upon at the beginning. These decrees were nothing other than the laws of nature, the theological doctrine of predestination thus preparing the way for the philosophy of mechanical determinism. It is of interest to note that both the concept and the term, ' the laws of nature,' were first used consistently by Descartes, who also generalised the notion that all material entities were mechanical contrivances, and thus were of the same qualititive nature. For Descartes, the Deity in the beginning had created matter and motion, and thereafter the universe was governed by ' the laws which God has put into nature,' namely the laws of mechanics.[26] According to the historian of the idea of ' laws of nature,' the use of the concept derived from the hypostatisation into the cosmic realm of the earthly rule through statute law developed by the absolute monarchs of the 16th and 17th centuries.[27] ' It is not mere chance,' wrote Zilsel, ' that the Cartesian idea of God as the legislator of the universe developed only forty years after Jean Bodin's theory of sovereignty.' Perhaps it is also not a matter of chance that, some forty years before Bodin, Calvin was working towards a conception of God as the law-giver of the universe, an Absolute Ruler who exercised His power directly, not through the mediacy of subordinate spiritual beings.

Whilst the Calvinists in theology were moving away from the hierarchical conception of the government of the universe towards an absolutist theory of cosmic rule, the early modern scientists were

effecting a not dissimilar transformation in natural philosophy. Copernicus, 1473-1543, whose heliocentric system of the world was published in 1543, rejected, implicitly at least, the gradation of the elements, for he assigned to the earth and its four elements that circularity of motion which hitherto had been the prerogative of celestial matter. He further emphasised the similarity of the earth to the other planets by investing the heavenly bodies with the property of gravity which previously had been considered to be peculiar to the earth. Again, according to his pupil Rheticus, Copernicus rejected the hierarchical conception that the higher celestial spheres influenced the motions of the lower.

> ' In the hypothesis of my teacher,' Rheticus wrote, ' the sphere of each planet advances uniformly with the motion assigned to it by nature, and completes its period without being forced into any inequality by the power of a higher sphere.'[28]

In the stead of the medieval view Copernicus advanced the conception that the sun had an absolute rule over the solar system.

> ' In the middle of all sits the Sun enthroned,' wrote Copernicus, ' In this most beautiful temple, could we place this luminary in any better position from which he can illuminate the whole at once? He is rightly called the Lamp, the Mind, the Ruler of the Universe . . . So the Sun sits as upon a royal throne, ruling his children, the planets, which circle round him.'[29]

In all of the important new systems of the world put forward during the 16th and 17th centuries the sun assumed a position of particular importance in the cosmic order. Such was the case even in the conservative system of Tycho Brahe, 1546-1601, which supposed the earth to be immobile at the centre of the universe, as in the medieval scheme.

> ' I think,' wrote Brahe in 1582, ' that the celestial motions are disposed in such a manner that only the moon, and the sun, with the eighth sphere, the most distant of all, have the centre of their motions in the earth: the five other planets turn about the sun as round their Chief and King . . . Thus the Sun is the Rule and the End of all the rotations, and, like Apollo in the midst of the Muses, he rules alone the entire celestial harmony of the motions which surround him.'[31]

William Gilbert of Colchester adopted yet another system of the world, which was similar to Brahe's scheme save that the earth performed a diurnal spin upon its axis and was not immobile, but his cosmic values were identical with those of Copernicus. The sun, Gilbert thought, was the noblest body in the universe, ' as he causes the planets to advance on their courses,' and served as ' the chief inciter of action in nature.'[31] The status of the earth was equal to that of the other heavenly bodies, for ' the earth's motion is performed with as little labour as the motions of the other heavenly bodies,' wrote Gilbert, ' neither is it inferior in dignity to some of these.'[32] In rejecting the concept of hierarchy, Gilbert seems to have sensed some connection between theology and natural philosophy.

> 'The Sun is not swept round by Mars' sphere (if sphere he have) and its motion, nor Mars by Jupiter's sphere, nor Jupiter by Saturn's,' wrote Gilbert, 'The higher do not tyranise over the lower, for the heaven of both the philosopher and the divine must be gentle, happy, tranquil, and not subject to changes.'[33]

With Johannes Kepler, 1571-1630, who finally showed in 1609 that the earth and the planets moved in elliptical orbits round the sun, the connection became more explicit, for he located the domicile of the theological Ruler of the universe in the central power of the world of the natural philosophers.

> 'The Sun,' wrote Kepler, 'alone appears, by virtue of his dignity and power, suited for this motive duty (of propelling the planets) and worthy to become the home of God himself . . . For if the Germans elect him as Caesar who has most power in the whole empire, who would hesitate to confer the votes of the celestial motions on him who already has been administering all other movements and changes by the benefit of the light which is entirely his possession?'[34]

Such a change in cosmic evaluations from the hierarchical to the absolute was effected not only in the philosophy of the larger world, the macrocosm, but also in theory of the lesser world, the microcosm of the human frame. Here the scientific revolution and the Protestant Reformation found their most intimate and direct connection, for it was the Reformer, Michael Servetus, 1509-53, who first put forward the theory of the lesser circulation of the blood in a small section of his theological work, *The Restoration of Christianity*, (1553). The main intellectual obstacles in the medieval world view to the development of the theory of the circulation of the blood were the notion that only celestial matter could move naturally with a circular motion, all terrestial motions, including that of the blood, being rectilinear, and the conception that the human body was governed by a hierarchy of three distinct organ systems, each with its own separate function. The vegetative life of man, — nourishment and growth, — had its seat in the liver, and was mediated by the dark red venous blood which ebbed to and fro in the veins under the impulse of a natural spirit. The animal function of muscular activity had its seat in the heart, and it was served by the bright red arterial blood which ebbed and flowed in the arteries, driven by a vital spirit. Finally the nervous function of irritability and sensitivity had its seat in the brain, and it functioned through a fluid in the nerves which was impelled by an animal spirit, (from the Latin *anima*, soul). Such a scheme was a particular manifestation of the general medieval view that the hierarchy of natural things was ordered triadically at every level,—classes, orders, genera, species, and individuals within those species. All of the beings of the universe fell into one or other of three general classes, — those that were wholly material, such as minerals, plants, and animals, those that were wholly spiritual, such as the angelic beings, and those that were mixed, namely human

beings. Each group and sub-group divided triadically. Thus there were animals of the land, the sea, and the air, men of labour, men of prayer, and men of war, according to early medieval versions, or labourers, burghers, and nobles, with a separate ecclesiastical triadic hierarchy, according to late medieval versions,[35] whilst above mankind were three triadic orders of angelic beings, and at the head of the scale of all beings in the universe was the supreme Trinity.

In theology Servetus was a Unitarian, rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity. He denied that the Son was co-eternal with the Father, and he was of the view that the Holy Spirit was the breath of the Deity, a pneuma pervading the atmosphere and the whole world.[36] Just as he denied the supreme Trinity, so Servetus denied the general concept of triadic hierarchy. In particular, having had a medical training, Servetus criticised the application of the concept to physiological theory, claiming that the natural, vital, and animal spirits in human body were one and the same, as ' In all of these there is the energy of the one spirit and of the light of God.'[37] Thus there were not two kinds of blood, the venous and the arterial, differentiated by the natural and the vital spirits, but only one blood containing a single spirit, since ' The vital is that which is communicated by the joins from the arteries to the veins in which it is called the natural.'[38] This single spirit of the blood was the soul, or rather ' The soul itself is the blood,' a view which Servetus supported with texts from the Old Testament.[39] Such a view implied that man was wholly mortal, the soul perishing with the body, and this heretical implication of his system was charged against Servetus at his trial by Calvin. The medieval doctrine of the three physiological fluids, the two bloods and the nervous fluid, had been a great obstacle to the development of the circulation theory, for any large scale movement of the blood from the veins to the arteries and the arteries to the veins, which the circulation theory required, would have involved the complete mixing of what were regarded as quite different fluids, each with their own separate function. The ideological innovations of Servetus enabled him to suggest that the blood circulated from the right to the left chamber of the heart through the lungs. In the lungs the blood encountered the inspired air and was purified, for ' by air God makes ruddy the blood,' and the soul in the blood participated in the Divine, as ' the Divine breath is in the air.'[40]

For Servetus the blood as vector of the soul had primacy of place in the human body, and with the blood was associated the heart as the prime organ:— ' The heart is the first to live, the source of heat in the middle of the body.'[41] Such a conception was developed by William Harvey, 1578-1657, physician to Charles I, who generalised and proved experimentally the theory of the circulation of the blood.

> ' The heart,' wrote Harvey in 1628, ' is the beginning of life: the sun of the microcosm, even as the sun in his turn might well be designated the heart of the world; for it is the heart by whose virtue and pulse the blood is moved, perfected, made apt to nourish, and is preserved from corruption and coagulation . . . The heart, like the prince in a kingdom, in whose hands lie the chief and highest authority, rules over all; it is the original and foundation from which all power is derived, on which all power depends in the animal body.'[42]

Harvey constantly searched for examples of circular motion in terrestial bodies, of which the circulation of the blood was the first, in order to give them parity of status with the presumed superior celestial bodies. In his later work on generation (1651), Harvey suggested that the embryological development of the chick was circular, and that the succession of individuals constituting a species was a form of circular motion emulating the movements of the heavenly bodies.

> ' This is the round which makes the race of common fowl eternal; now pullet, now egg, the series is continued in perpetuity: from frail and perishing individuals an immortal species is engendered. By these, and means like to these, do we see many inferior or terrestial things brought to emulate the perpetuity of superior or celestial things.'[43]

Such re-evaluations in the theories of the microcosm of the human body and of the macrocosm of the world at large appear to have had an influence upon the metaphors and similes of majesty used at the period. It had been customary to compare a monarch in his realm to the mind in the body, or the Primum Mobile governing the universe from above, but now the sun at the centre of the world, and the heart at the centre of the body, came in as the images and analogies of majesty. John Norden, 1548-1626, in his *Christian Familiar Comfort*, (1600) described Elizabeth I as the Primum Mobile of England,[44] and Francis Bacon too used the same analogy in his essay *On Sedition*.[45] But William Harvey dedicated his *De Motu Cordis* (1628) to Charles I as ' the sun of the world around him, the heart of the republic '[46] and when Louis XIV came of age in 1660 he was hailed, not as the Primum Mobile of France, but as *le Roi Soleil*.

The new cosmic evaluations also had an influence upon the theology of one of the Protestant movements of the English Civil War period, the Mortalists, so-termed because they held that the soul of man perished with his body. The most notable member of the sect was John Milton,[47] whilst the chief exponent of the Mortalist theology was Richard Overton, a prominent figure in the Leveller movement. Overton held that the Deity must reside in the sun, since the scientists considered that the sun was the most exalted and powerful of the heavenly bodies. The Deity, Overton argued, ' ascended upward from the Earth into some part of the coelestiall bodies above, therefore, without doubt He must be in the most excellent, glorious,

and heavenly part thereof, which is the SUN, the most excellent piece of the whole Creation, the Epitome of God's power, . . . and according to the famous Copernicus and Tycho Braheus, it is highest in station to the whole Creation.'[48] The Mortalists' central doctine that the soul of man perished with his body was supported by the view of Servetus, Harvey, and others, that the soul was itself the blood, a view which Overton quoted but did not draw upon extensively, discussing at greater length the idea that the soul was the sum total of man's faculties, those faculties perishing with the body. The doctrine that the soul of man perished with his body served to carry further the attack upon the concept of hierarchy which had been initiated by the Calvinists and the scientists. Calvin and the astronomers had questioned the existence of the celestial hierarchies but the Mortalists now came to doubt the reality of the terrestial hierarchies of men, animals, and plants. If man were wholly mortal, then he did not differ essentially from the animals, Overton argued, for animals as well as man would ultimately rise again.

> ' For all other Creatures as well as man shall be raised and delivered from Death at the Resurrection . . . That which befalleth the sonnes of man, befalleth Beasts . . . as one dyeth, so dyeth the other, yea they have all one breath, so that man hath no preheminence above a beast.'[49]

Thus Overton accorded the same status to all beings, though they were all subject to a single Absolute Power. Such a conception also pervaded Overton's political philosophy, the radical democratic individualism of the Leveller movement. Over and above individual men, though acting with their consent, was the power of Parliament, ' chosen to work our delivérance, and to estate us in natural and just liberty agreeable to reason and common equity.'[50] Basing himself on the new mechanical philosophy, rather than the new reformed religion, and placing a greater emphasis upon the sovereignty of the state power, Hobbes advanced the similar conception that human society consisted of atomic, self-moving individuals, by birth equal in their capacities, who had contracted to relinquish their autonomy in return for the protection of an absolute sovereign, — a monarch or an assembly of governors, — who controlled the great Leviathan of the state, ' that Mortal God, to which we owe under the Immortal God, our peace and defence,'[51] More radical political thinkers, such as the Diggers and the early Quakers, placed a greater emphasis upon the equality of all men and all beings, carrying the criticism of the concept of hierarchy to its ultimate conclusion within the framework of theology, — pantheism. The Divine Absolute was merged into His creatures, to provide the communal sovereignty of egalitarian human society and the rational integument of the universe as a whole. ' The whole Creation of Fire, Water, Earth, and Aire,'

wrote Gerrard Winstanley ' and all the varieties of bodies made up thereof, is the cloathing of God.'[52] The Deity was a moving spirit, present in all things and in all men, ' He is the incomprehensible spirit, Reason.'[53] There was no distinction between Man and God, — ' They that have the Spirit of God are equal with God,'[54] as George Fox put it, — and *a fortiori* there should be no gradations between man and man:— ' None ought to be lords or landlords over another,' wrote Winstanley, ' but the earth is free for every son and daughter of mankind to live free upon.'[55]

Generally speaking, criticism of the medieval concept of hierarchy amongst men who were influential in politics, religion, or science, did not proceed beyond the idea of cosmic absolutism during the 17th century. Pantheism and the mechanical philosophy were integrated by Spinoza, 1632-77, who was associated with the Dutch Collegiants, a sect similar to the English Quakers, but his system did not exert much influence until the 19th century. Even within the limitations of the idea of cosmic absolutism, the Mortalist synthesis of theology with natural philosophy did not command an extensive following, though some of the Mortalist doctrines enjoyed a certain vogue during the 17th century,[56] and they were perpetuated, with minor modifications, by the Christadelphian sect.[57] The early modern astronomers and the Mortalists adhered to the view, which had been generally accepted during the middle ages, that there was but one world, our own solar system, which was bounded by the fixed stars. However, it came to be accepted, notably through Giordano Bruno (1548-1600), that each star was a sun surrounded by planets, which were inhabited by creatures similar to those on earth, and it was this doctrine of the plurality of worlds which helped to bring together the theories of early modern science and Calvinist theology as developed by the Puritans in England. The doctrine, even in its most restricted form wherein it was supposed that the planets of our solar system or the moon alone were inhabited, carried implications which ran counter to the concept of hierarchy, for it gave weight to the notion that the earth and the heavenly bodies were of the same qualitative nature, and were not graded in status, since they supported the same creatures. Through arrogance, wrote Montaigne, man ' dareth imaginarily place himselfe above the circle of the Moone, and reduce heaven under his feet. It is through the vanity of the same imagination that he dare equall himselfe to God, that he ascribeth divine conditions unto himselfe, that he selecteth and separatheth himselfe from out the ranke of other creatures.'[58] In its extended form, wherein it was supposed that there was an infinity of inhabited worlds in the universe, the doctrine tended to assign the same status to all finite existents. This was one of the aspects of the infinite which led to Pascal's inquietude.

> ' In comparison with all these Infinites, all finites are equal, and I see no reason for fixing our imagination on one more than on another. The only comparison which we make of our selves to the infinite is painful to us.'[59]

In England during the 1630's John Wilkins attempted to overcome the greatest single obstacle to the union of science and Calvinist theology, — the early Protestant practice of interpreting the Scriptures literally,—and to integrate his science with his theology by means of the doctrine of the plurality of worlds. In 1638 he published his *Discovery of a New World*, a work endeavouring to prove that there was another world of animate and rational creatures on the moon. Here he had no texts from Scripture against him, indeed some were in his favour, but even these he rejected.[60] Wilkins did not defend the new Copernican theory in this work, but he attempted to establish the doctrines which had derived from that theory, or which had become ancillary to it. Quoting the work of the astronomers, who had shown that there were spots on the face of the sun, and mountains and apparently seas on the moon, Wilkins affirmed, ' That the Heavens do not consist of any such Pure Matter which can Privilege them from the like Change and Corruption as these Inferior Bodies are Liable unto.'[61] Since the moon in particular resembled the earth, ' we may Guess in the General that there are some Inhabitants in that Plannet: for why else did Providence Furnish that place with all such Conveniences of Habitation.'[62] A similar consequence followed, Wilkins noted, from the theory adopted by the followers of Copernicus: ' Now if our Earth were one of the Plannets, (as it is according to them) then why may not another of the Plannets be an Earth ?'[63]

Wilkins' next work, *A Discourse Concerning a New Plannet*, 1640 was a full defence of the Copernican theory. Much of the book, about half of it in fact, attempted to reconcile the Copernican theory with the Biblical texts which seemed to favour the idea of the diurnal motion of the heavens, or to oppose the theory of the motion of the earth. Here agains Wilkins rejected the practice of interpreting the Scriptures literally, declaring that the Bible was not a philosophical treatise but a work intended for the capacity of the popular mind. In bringing together his science and his theology, Wilkins applied Calvin's thesis that the angelic beings were superfluous in the government of the universe to the particular case of the motions of the heavenly bodies. It was unreasonable of the schoolmen, wrote Wilkins, ' who make the Faculty whereby the Angels move the Orbs to be the very same with their Understandings and Will . . . Since it were then a needless thing for Providence to have appointed Angels unto this business, which might have been done as well by the only will of God.'[64] Wilkins' argument here exemplified his general contention that nature was essentially economical and frugal in her

operations. It was 'agreeable to the Wisdom of Providence,' Wilkins felt, that Nature 'does never use any tedious difficult means to perform that which may be accomplished by shorter and easier ways.'[65] Such a notion, with its Calvinist flavour, was of particular importance in modern science, providing the root concept of the various 'minimum' and 'conservation' principles governing motion and change in nature, which were developed, often with theological justifications, by the scientists of the 17th and 18th centuries.[66] There had been approaches towards the idea during the middle ages, notably in the case of Ockham's razor principle, but such approaches for the most part had remained comparatively fruitless. While change took place by routes of minimum effort in nature, according to Wilkins, the world was peopled by a large, if not a maximum diversity of beings. 'There may be many other Species of Creatures besides those that are already known in the world,' he wrote, ''Tis not improbable that God might create some of all Kinds, that so He might more Compleatly Glorifie himself in the Works of His Power and Wisdom.'[67] Such an idea was not specifically modern, for similar notions had been current in antiquity and the middle ages. The translator of a medieval theology, in arguing for the existence of a multiplicity of angelic beings, had expressed the idea in the following way:— 'We must believe that the angels are there in marvellous and inconceivable numbers, because the honour of a king consists in the great crowd of his vassals, while his disgrace or shame consists in their paucity.'[68] However the Deity of the 17th century was a more powerful being than the God of the middle ages, for He had created a plurality, or even an infinity of similar worlds, not just one, and the maximum possible diversity of creatures, not merely a large number.[69] These creatures were no longer connected by relations of domination and servitude, for under the Divine Absolute they had some degree of autonomy, deriving their self-government from an inner source. In the motions of bodies, and in her operations generally, wrote Wilkins, 'Nature does commonly make use of some inward principle.'[70] Such a world, stocked to the maximum capacity with thrifty, self-moving beings, whose actions were predetermined by the cosmic laws laid down by the Deity in the beginning, came to be considered the best and most perfect of all possible worlds. 'The most sagacious man,' wrote Wilkins after the Restoration, when he became bishop of Chester, 'is not able to find out any blot or error in this great Volume of the World, as if any thing in it had been an imperfect essay at the first, such as afterwards stood in need of mending: But all things continue as they were from the very beginning of the Creation.'[71] Such a notion, which was very popular in the late 17th and early 18h centuries, implied, as Pope put it, that 'Whatever is, is right,' and

that any possible change must be, of necessity, for the worse.[72] Thus it was that the new world view constructed by the Puritan scientists of the mid-17th century served as a basis for the cosmic toryism of the literary theologians of the later Stuart period.

The early works of Wilkins, the *Discovery* (1638) and the *Discourse* (1640) were directed in particular against the Anglican, Alexander Ross, 1591-1654, one of Charles I's chaplains, who with Biblical texts, had attacked the new science and defended the medieval cosmology in his *Commentum de Terrae Motu* (1634). In this work Ross had attacked not only scientific, but also theological criticism of the medieval cosmology, objecting in particular to a book published in 1625 by Nathaniel Carpenter, 1589-1628, who had made light of the idea that hierarchies of angelic beings propelled the heavenly bodies round their courses, but who had refused to accept the Copernican theory, mainly on the grounds that it conflicted with the Scriptures.[73] After the publication of Wilkin's books, Ross returned to the attack in *The New Planet No Planet* (1646), taking his stand again on the ground of Scriptural literalism. Ross, in fact, conducted a last line defence against many criticisms of the medieval world view in mid-17th century England, and counter attacked against the new concept of cosmic absolutism. He assailed Hobbes in the *Leviathan drawne out with a Hooke* (1653), quarrelled with the mechanical philosophy of Raleigh's historiography in *Raleigh's errors corrected* (n. d.) and in two further works (1645 and 1651) Ross even took the conservative Thomas Browne to task for criticising the 'Vulgar Errors' of the ancients.

After the period of the Civil Wars and the Commonwealth, the Bible and the works of the ancient and medieval philosophers were no longer taken as authoritative upon matters relating to the structure of the world in England. Even the makers of popular almanacs generally adopted the Copernican system of the world[74] and critics of science took pains to deny, for fear of riducule, that they believed in the medieval world system.[75] When Newton's *Principia* appeared in 1687, it encountered little religious opposition in England, for Wilkins and the men of his generation had borne the brunt of the Anglican resistance to science, and had made apparent the elements common to the new science and the new religion. The physico-theological system of Newton, like its immediate predecessors, enshrined the concept of cosmic absolutism, though the Deity was more of a privileged observer of the universe than a privileged ruler, in the Newtonian system. If the universe were governed entirely by laws laid down in the beginning, then there was no need for Divine intervention in the day to day running of the world. Calvin had not discussed such an implication, and he had supposed the Deity to be both the legislator and the active ruler of the universe.

However, the English Puritans of the mid-17th century developed the idea latent in Calvin's teachings that the Deity was bound by his own ordinances, so that God could not do ' that which is contrary to the Rule of Nature.'[76] Thus the Deity came to be considered as the constitutional Head of the cosmic system rather than the absolute Ruler of the universe. As the Independent theologian, Thomas Goodwin, 1600-80, put it: ' Men do with God as the Venetians do with their duke; they set him up in all matters of state attendance as a sovreign prince, but level his power so low that he is no more than an ordinary senator.'[77] In the systems of the natural philosophers the role of the Deity was changed similarly from that of the Ruler of the universe to that of the Observer of cosmic events. Descartes had presumed that the *concours ordinaire* of the Deity was necessary to the preservation of the universe as it is from instant to instant, but Newton found only a few defects in the machine of the universe which required the constant attention of an omnipresent cosmic engineer, and soon it was demonstrated that the Newtonian world was entirely self-running and self-repairing. However, the idea that there was, or could be, a single privileged observer in the universe, an idea which was part of the early Protestant-scientific theory of cosmic absolutism, lived on until the 20th century when the cosmological principle that all observers in the universe are equivalent was found to be a more satisfactory basis for physical theory.

Wadham College, Oxford. *S. F. Mason.*

NOTES

[1] G. N. Clark, *Science and Social Welfare in the Age of Newton*, Oxford, 1937, pp. 60-91.

[2] B. Hessen ' The Social and Economic Roots of Newton's ' Principia ',' in *Science at the Cross Roads*, London, 1931.

[3] R. K. Merton, ' Science, Technology, and Society in 17th Century England,' *Osiris*, 1938, IV, 360.

[4] E. G. R. Taylor, *Tudor Geography*, London, 1930, pp. 24-27, *Late Tudor and Early Stuart Geography*, London, 1943, pp. 29-30.

[5] J. Ward, *The Lives of the Gresham Professors*, London, 1740, p. 19.

[6] F. R. Johnson, ' Gresham College,' *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, 1940, vol. I, No. 4.

[7] E. Zilsel, ' The Origins of Gilbert's Scientific Method,' *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, 1941, vol. II, No. 1.

[8] B. Farrington, *Francis Bacon: Philosopher of Industrial Science*, London, 1951.

[9] D. Stimson, ' Puritanism and the new philosophy in 17th century England,' *Bull. Inst. Hist. Medicine*, 1935, III, 321-334.

[10] J. Ward, op. cit., p. 82, and Dictionary of National Biography.

[11] J. Wilkins, *Mathematical Magick, London*, 1648, introduction.

[12] M. Ornstein, *The Role of Scientic Societies in the 17th Century*, Chicago, 1928, pp. 96-106.

[13] See A. O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1936, for the history of the idea, and E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture*, London, 1943, for the late medieval version.

[14] Dionysius, *Works*, trans. J. Parker, Oxford and London, 1897, Vol. II, p. 22.

[15] P. Duhem, *Systême du Monde*, 5 vols, Paris, 1913-17, vol. V, chs. 10-12, pp. 404-559.

[16] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles* trans. by members of the Dominican Order, 3 vols, London, 1928, vol. III pt. I, chs. 78-82, pp. 195-207.

[17] J. Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. H. Beveridge, 2 vols, London, 1949, Vol. II, p. 330.

[18] Op. cit., vol. II, p. 360.

[19] Op. cit., vol. I, p. 144.

[20] Op. cit., vol. I, p. 149.

[21] Op. cit., vol. I, p. 179.

[22] J. Preston, *The New Covenant*, 5th ed. London, 1630, p. 46.

[23] R. Baxter, *The Certainty of Worlds of Spirits*, London, 1691, p. 222.

[24] J. Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, edited A. Clark, 2 vols. Oxford, 1898, Vol. II, p. 318.

[25] Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici*, Everyman ed. 1947, p. 34.

[26] R. Descartes, *Le Monde*, Ch. VII, *Descartes: Selections*, ed. R. M. Eaton, New York, 1927, p. 322.

[27] E. Zilsel, 'The Genesis of the Concept of Physical Law,' *Philosophical Review*, 1942, LI, 245.

[28] Rheticus, *Narratio Prima*, trans. E. Rosen, *Three Copernican Treatises*, New York, 1939, p. 146.

[29] Copernicus, *De Revolutionibus*, Bk. I. Ch. 10, trans. J. F. Dobson and S. Brodetsky, *Occasional Notes, Roy. Astronomical Society*, London, 1947, vol. II, no. 10, p. 19.

[30] Tycho Brahe, *Opera Omnia*, Frankfurt, 1648, Lib. II, pp. 95-96.

[31] William Gilbert, *De Magnete*, trans. P. Fleury Mottelay, London 1893, p. 333.

[32] Op. cit., p. 339.

[33] Op. cit., p. 324.

[34] Quoted by E. A. Burtt, *Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Science*, London, 1949, p. 48.

[35] *La Théologie Naturelle de Raymond Sebond*, traduit par Montaigne, Paris, 1581, ch. 220, p. 262.

[36] R. Willis, *Servetus and Calvin*, London, 1878, p. 200.

[37] Michael Servetus, *Christianismi Restitutio*, Nuremburg, 1790, p. 169.

[38] Op. cit., p. 169.

[39] Op. cit., p. 170.

[40] Op. cit., p. 169 and p. 182.

[41] Op. cit., p. 169.

[42] William Harvey, *Works*, trans. R. Willis, London, 1847, p. 47 and p. 83.

[43] Op. cit., p. 285.

[44] J. Norden, *Christian Familiar Comfort*, London, 1600, p. 59.

[45] F. Bacon, *Essays*, Everyman ed. 1939, p. 43.

[46] W. Harvey, op. cit., p. 3.

[47] D. Saurat, *Milton, Man and Thinker*, London 1946, p. 268 ff.

[48] R. O., *Mans' Mortallitie*, Amsterdam, 1643, pp. 27-29.

[49] Op. cit., p. 50 and title page.

[50] G. H. Sabine, *History of Political Theory*, London 1937, p. 484.

[51] Sabine, op. cit., p. 468.

[52] G. Winstanley, *Works*, ed. G. H. Sabine, Cornell, 1941, p. 451.

[53] Op. cit., p. 107.

[54] G. Fox, *Saul's Errand to Damascus*, London, 1653, p. 8.

[55] Sabine, op. cit., p. 491.

[56] R. Fludd, *Mosaicall Philosophy*, London, 1659, p. 66. J. B. van Helmont, *Oriatrike*, trans. J. Chandler, London, 1662, p. 796.

[57] Saurat, op. cit., p. 268 ff.

[58] Montaigne, *Essays*, Everyman ed., 3 vols, London, 1938, vol. II, p. 142.

[59] Pascal *Pensées*, Everyman ed. London, 1931, p. 20.

[60] J. Wilkins, *A Discovery of a New World*, 4th ed., London 1684, Bk. I., p. 145.

[61] Op. cit., Bk. I, p. 31.

[62] Op. cit., Bk. I, p. 144.

[63] Op. cit., Bk. I, p. 70.

[64] Op. cit., Bk. II, *A discourse Concerning a new Planet*, p. 159.

[65] Op. cit., Bk. II, p. 150.

[66] P. E. B. Jourdain, '*The Principle of Least Action*,' Monist, 1912, XXII, 285-304, 414-459, and 1913, XXIII, 277.

[67] Wilkins, op. cit., Bk. I. p. 146.

[68] *Théologie Naturelle de Raymond de Sebond*, traduit par Ian Martin, Paris, 1566, Bk. VI, p. 155b.

[69] Lovejoy, op. cit., chs. IV-VI, pp. 99-208.

[70] Wilkins, op. cit., Bk. II, p. 158.

[71] J. Wilkins, *Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion*, 4th ed., London 1699, p. 78.

[72] B. Willey, *The Eighteenth Century Background*, London 1946, Ch. II, p. 43-56.

[73] G. McColley, 'The Ross-Wilkins Controversy,' *Annals of Science* 1938, III, 153-189, p. 180.

[74] M. Nicholson, 'English Almanacs and the New Astronomy,' *Annals of Science*, 1939, IV, 1.

[75] R. F. Jones, *Ancients and Moderns*, St. Louis, 1936, ch. IX.

[76] Quoted by Perry Miller, *The New England Mind*, New York, 1939, p. 226.

[77] Thomas Goodwin, *Works*, 6 Vols., Edinburgh, 1861-63, vol. VI, p. 507

Communication

Puritanism and the Poor

HILL'S STIMULATING ARTICLE ON WILLIAM PERKINS[1] CALLS OUR attention to a Puritan thinker who has been too little noticed of late years unless in America. It may however be open to the criticism of giving a one-sided and unsympathetic picture of its subject.

Taking his stand on the principle that " the fundamental concepts of Puritan thought are bourgeois,"[2] Hill agrees with L. B. Wright's view of Perkins as a thinker with " unusual significance in the history of bourgeois ideas and ideals," one who illustrates how " Calvinism produced a hospitable milieu for the development of the capitalistic spirit."[3] From this position he arrives at some conclusions that do not seem to be warranted by Perkins' own writings; unless we suppose it to have been an understood thing between Perkins and his audience that the great bulk of what he said was to be ignored as mere padding.

It is no doubt true that there was a conflict of moralities in England in the pre-Civil War period; but it seems schematic to speak of " two sharply contrasted ways of life . . . a traditional mediæval catholic economic morality on the defensive, a Protestant and capitalist ethic on the offensive," and to add that the latter arrived in Perkins at " clarity, coherence and a new rigour."[4] In some respects Perkins' attitude *is* in sharp contrast to an older, Catholic one. In other respects no such contradiction is visible. There had not, after all, been one single, simple, homogeneous ' mediæval ideology,' the same for all classes at all times. Hill refers to the ostentatious liberality of " the ruling class in feudal society," and contrasts it with the thrifty habits of the " nascent capitalist," meaning thereby the " small merchant or craftsman or farmer " who was beginning to employ a few assistants.[5] Is this a logical comparison? Feudal lord and *big* capitalist might usefully be set beside each other; for the dwarf ' capitalist ' typical in pre-Civil War times the proper comparison is rather with the small burgher class of the old craft-guilds, out of which these newer men were emerging. From this point of view Perkins shows vastly more of continuity between old and new than of contradiction. Guild brothers had to save up first if they wanted to hold a feast; they had to support indigent members, and could scarcely consider thrift a vice and riotous spending a virtue. To anatomise the Puritan Revolution would be easy if it

were really the case that by 1600 two and only two ideologies were marshalled against each other, and it only remained for them to fight it out. It may be closer to reality to think of an old burgher class trying to hold on to and adapt its principles in a changing environment, until in the end, by often devious processes, it turned into something revolutionary by dint of struggling to remain conservative.

The men Perkins addressed were only beginning to be ' capitalists,' and were not conscious of themselves as such, and it was not his mission to make them so. Two diverse possibilities were latent in the Puritanism of 1600, only later to be forced into the open by a decade of revolution and civil war. As Hill remarks, one of Perkins' keenest readers was the Leveller Walwyn.[6] By 1600 satirists might already find symptoms of that virtuous humbug, that " hard-heartednesse and uncharitablenesse of Professors " complained of fifty years later by Walwyn;[7] something already in the vein of Holy Willy's prayer for ' grace and gear.' In Perkins' own philosophy the *germs* of something congenial to pious greed may be discernible if peered at long enough through a twentieth century microscope. But Hill seems to be reading the harshness of a matured post-1660 capitalism back into an earlier stage, as many since Weber have tended to do, treating as it were haughty butterfly and humble caterpillar as the same thing.[8] Hill's capitalist, for example, — and this is his main thesis — " grudged every penny spent over and above the minimum necessary " on his employees,[9] and was bent on exploiting the sanguinary legislation against the homeless poor in order to hammer them by brute force into a disciplined proletariat. Perkins on the other hand discusses capital-labour relations in a very patriarchal style, as one element in the pattern of Christian *family* life. A ' servant ' should work hard and uncomplainingly; his master should feed him well, not work him too hard, pay his wages promptly and in full, and take every care of him in sickness.[10]

Perkins' keynote was a sober realism, a grappling with men and things as they were. Along with this went his simple, popularising style, and his turning away from arid dogmatics to practical discussion of conduct. The later and most active years of his short life were anxious years for England, when preachers as well as poets were thinking about the succession, the Spaniards, and the persecutions in foreign lands. These were moreover years when the Puritan movement was under a cloud. It had failed to convert the powers that were, and it was much vilified and derided by the profane. We are free to think of Perkins as recognising this situation, and seeking to broaden and deepen the movement by going out into the streets and bringing it home to the business and bosoms of common men. Here, much more than in any transmutation of the " sin of avarice " into the " duty of thrift,"[11] may be placed his originality. Altogether

he appears in his writings a less comfortable and complacent personage than Hill makes him: a conscientious and far from cold-blooded teacher, honestly wrestling with the problems of a changing world; in his own estimation no spokesman of fashionable opinion, but a voice in the wilderness. " We preachers may crie till our lungs flie out, or be spent within us, and men are moved no more than stones."[12]

In making out his case, Hill excuses himself for quoting " unfairly " by assuming that the bits he is picking out from Perkins' sermons were also picked out and laid to heart by the more avaricious of Perkins' listeners.[13] Very likely they were; as Perkins knew, " there is in the devill an admirable quicknesse and agility."[14] But that does not convict Perkins himself of being a champion of justification by success, or divine favour proved by worldly prosperity.[15] He and his disciples kept clear of any such crude materialism.[16] *Enrichissez-vous* was no part of his evangel. On the contrary, he remained faithful to the trenchant dictum of Latimer: " What shall be the end of all covetous persons? Eternal damnation."[17] His warnings against covetousness, that " mother sin " of sins,[18] were incessant; even if, being no Anabaptist, he had to tolerate the existence of rich men. As a matter of fact he seems to have thought inherited wealth (accompanied by due social responsibilities) less damaging to morals than acquired wealth, the latter being " commonly (though not alwayes) unjustly gotten: for it is an hard thing to become rich without injustice."[19] A Puritan's ' calling ' was not a summons to egotistic activity of any kind; it meant the performance of a man's duties in all his social relations. He must " apply himself to the uttermost of his power to do all he can for the good of his country; and he must so deale that he may be helpfull to all with whom hee dealeth, and hurtfull to none."[20] Later economic history might perhaps show this counsel to be illusory; for Perkins it was real enough.

Just as riches were no sign of grace, poverty was no sign of reprobation. Perkins was far from seeing the poor as outcasts, inferiors, scavengers among the refuse-bins of salvation. The Gospel, he said, had long been preached in England, and " the poorer sort among us doe more heartily receive it, than they of the richer sort . . . Because riches steale away the heart."[21] His immediate audience at Cambridge was largely made up of poor students, destined to enter his own poorly paid profession; he was not preaching to bloated aldermen. As Knappen sees,[22] the Puritan ethic in its concentrated form was the mode of thought of a specialised clerical class. Hoarding, speculation, high prices, were evils for the struggling clergy and their families, as well as for poor labourers. This makes it all the harder to believe that when the Puritan clergy

denounced these evils, as they did incessantly, they really meant just the opposite of what they said.

Mediæval Catholic countries were always well stocked with beggars and vagrants — feudalism, like capitalism, did not function in practice as it does in textbooks. These in the 16th century were reinforced by the detritus of a crumbling feudal society. Spain was full of them. In northern Europe monastic charity, the traditional palliative, was removed by a set of very un-Puritanical nobles. Hill thinks of the destitute swarms roaming about England as evicted peasants, victims of harsh landlords, and enjoying the sympathy of the ordinary people.[23] There were others, however; pilfering Nyms and Bardolphs, cast-off retainers who had vapoured and bullied in their day, and in and round London a large criminal class. Many even of the genuine victims of oppression must, as Harrison noted, have become none the less dangerous to society:[24] not so much to the well protected rich, against whom they were too demoralised to combine, as to the middle and lower classes.

The same plunderers who seized the monastic lands framed, to keep paupers in order, the branding, cropping, and flogging laws, examples of feudal rather than of capitalist ferocity, which in backward Scotland had begun as early as 1424 and were carried to even worse extremes than in England. In more civilised England these laws could only be a stopgap, and by the end of the century if not earlier they had ceased to be enforced with any thoroughness, as Perkins asserts and an early Act of James I's reign repeats.[25] Perkins stands charged with having approved of them. He did, indeed, approve of the legislation of 1597, which gave up branding, though it retained flogging for able-bodied individuals caught " begging, vagrant or misordering themselves," and provided for the building of hospitals for the helpless, and finding of work for the unemployed. As to flogging, it would not be unfair to say that Perkins countenanced it — as many do in England today — as a deterrent against crimes of violence. There was no vindictive cat-o'-nine-tails spirit about him. He dwells with evident feeling on the maxim that justice should be tempered with mercy, in some ways outstripping the advance of English law by a couple of centuries.[26]

Catholic countries faced with similar problems followed the line of least resistance, and allowed society to go on falling apart into a handful of plutocrats and a multitude of paupers, with monks between them to take in donations and give out soup. The result may be seen in the Naples taken over by Joseph Bonaparte in 1806, where he found brigandage the only profession for men of enterprise, and in the capital one hundred and seventy convents, one third of the population

paupers, and naked creatures dying of hunger in the streets without attracting the least attention.[27]

Perkins did not believe in philanthropy of that kind. Equally he did not try to button up the pockets of the Church or stop its ears to the cry of distress. He enforced the duties of charity in season and out of season. Collecting alms, relieving the poor, visiting the sick, he set among the sacred employments of the Sabbath.[28] He lamented, and other Puritans echoed him, that England had grown hard-hearted:— " where is the man that doth pitie the poore and doth good to them according to his abilitie?"[29] Sincere religion without liberal alms-giving he would have thought inconceivable. Only charity, like labour in one's vocation, must be ' socially necessary ': it must not be the haphazard, superstitious tossing of a purseful of coins to a throng round a coach-door, but rational, systematic, animated by civic responsibility as well as private piety.

His system was founded on the distinction between *beggary*, which was to be put an end to — *there should be no beggar in Israel* — and *poverty*, which was to be given assistance.[30] He would give regular relief to the sick, aged, infirm, orphaned, and even to persons who had jobs but whose labour failed to yield them a living wage. These categories must have included a large proportion of all those in need of help. They were to be relieved *at home*, instead of having to drag themselves from door to door in quest of a sporadic charity. The change was very much for the better; and it would not be Perkins' fault if the system were administered in any grudging spirit. The poor, he contended, had a *right* to be supported by society: " providing of maintenance for the poore, is not a worke of freedome or liberty, left to mens choice . . . and the not doing of it is injustice, against the law of God and of Nature . . . "[31]

He condemned begging not merely as a nuisance to householders but as a disgrace to the magistrates and the wealthy, who ought to render it unnecessary; it was " the very seminary of vagabonds," and, he added equally sensibly, it was inequitable — " for the boldest and most clamorous begger, carries away all the almes from the rest.[32] Anyone who has lived in a beggar-infested country will appreciate this point. And, though Perkins may have lacked insight into the feelings that made some broken men prefer a roving life of ' freedom,' even with every man's hand against them, to tamely vegetating in their own parishes,[33] still the 16th century vagabondage *was* a state unfit for human beings, as we are reminded by Mad Tom in *Lear*, or the outcasts in Dekker's *Belman of London*.

Did Perkins, then, think of these hapless outlaws as a *massa damnata*, souls abandoned by man and God, wretched on earth and reserved to the wrath to come? He may have thought some of them irreclaimable (as many of us today think of some of our slum denizens),

and this may have been linked in his mind with the Calvinistic conviction that God's promises are not to all men. But could any denouncer of depopulating enclosures really hold that "original sin was the sole cause of vagabondage?"[34] Hill insists that Perkins' social thinking is organically connected with his theology,[35] though he has remarked earlier that Perkins' theology is "a modified and adapted Calvinism" which tries to make "assurance of salvation" as easy as possible.[36] His view of the precise connection in Perkins' mind between theology and the social problem is perhaps not made quite clear. He seems to argue that vagrant paupers are so, in Perkins' opinion, because they are not among the Elect, who are a minority.[37] Yet Perkins maintains that vagrancy can be abolished. and he cannot imply that vagrants can be rescued from Reprobation by being flogged into useful activity. Nor, surely, does Perkins think that vagrants, being reprobate, are at the mercy of the Elect, who may reduce them to slavery as vagrants were being legally reduced in Scotland. It is easier to understand his language as meaning that a good life, carrying 'assurance of salvation,' can only be lived within the community of good men, that is within the Church; that the vagrant has it in his power, with the aid of good men inspired by God, to turn over a new leaf and enter this community; that once inside it he is clothed with the rights and duties of 'Christian liberty,' entitled to the tolerant fraternal treatment that Perkins exhorts Church-members to show one another,[38] and able to attain to the same hope as his fellows. Perkins is very careful about how he speaks of faith and works, but he confesses that his own leaning is towards an 'open-door' theology, as near universal a means of salvation as orthodox doctrine can stretch to,[39] and it would hardly do him justice to suppose that he wanted to 'modify Calvinism' by narrowing the gateway of Heaven for the poor and broadening it for the rich.

In other words, Perkins' general view is the rational one that a man is demoralised because he is a vagabond, not vice versa. "The neglect of provision for the poore, is the cause of beggary."[40] Consequently we should see his emphasis as falling on the positive idea of finding decent work for those capable of it, not on the negative idea of flogging them into toiling for other men's enrichment. Willingness to work was the outward sign of progress towards regeneration; and its true function was to guarantee to each individual that minimum standard of material well-being that Protestant realism saw as the necessary basis of individual self-respect, integrity, and spiritual independence: that material basis for want of which Lutheranism in its homeland had already lost vitality. Perkins enjoined on every man "to labour with his owne hands, *that he may need nothing*."[41] The new Poor Law machinery taking shape in Perkins'

last years had its humanitarian and progressive side. With all its faults it was a great social experiment to which, on its better and not on its worse side, Puritan ideals contributed.[42]

Hill throws out the illuminating suggestion that progressive opinion in Perkins' day was groping towards a conception of poverty (or destitution, at least) being eliminated altogether.[43] Here is something he might indeed speak of as a " revolution in thought about the poor "[44]: no less than the reabsorption into the body politic of a whole disinherited class. As usual, Perkins thought of individual and commonwealth together. If the nation would but turn from its sins — including man's inhumanity to man — " we might assure our selves of the glorious prosperity of England, to continue from generation to generation."[45] But the way forward as he saw it was *not* by any loosening of Mammon from his clogs, or removing barriers to capital accumulation and trusting to unrestricted self-interest. His ' new deal ' was to be inspired by far more, not less, of Christian brotherliness. His better future was conceived in religious, not economic, terms. Men truly converted would cease to be " fierce and cruell against the Church, and one against another."[46]

To put it differently, society aided by grace had within it powers of self-regeneration. Perkins was moving away from the Lutheran pessimism, the conviction of a human savagery only to be held in check by the ' red and bloody sword ': moving cautiously, avoiding also any Anabaptist Utopias, towards the idea of a true commonwealth ruled by a blend of civilised force and Christian goodwill. It was a vision not much unlike that of the Levellers and the armed Saints.

University of Edinburgh. *V. Kiernan.*

NOTES

[1] *Past and Present,*' no. 2, p. 32.

[2] Hill, ib., p. 45.

[3] L. B. Wright, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 3 no. 2, 182.

[4] Hill, 34, 38.

[5] Hill, 35.

[6] Hill, 33.

[7] W. Schenk, *The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution*, 1948, 51.

[8] B. N. Nelson, *The Idea of Usury*, 1949, remarks that Weber's essay was " impressionistic and restricted," though brilliant, and that " a more refined analysis of the problem is in order " (154; 132 n. 54).

[9] Hill, 35.

[10] Perkins, *Works*, Cambridge 1609-13, III, 696-8. Latimer says very much the same (Last Sermon before Edward VI, 1550, in Everyman edition of sermons, 294).

[11] Hill, 34.

[12] Perkins, ib., III, 424.

[13] Hill, 42.

[14] Perkins, III, 610.

[15] Hill (42) finds fault with Perkins' rule that we should be guided by the standard of wordly expenditure of the worthiest men in our own walk of life — " That was to allow bourgeois society to set its own standards." But Perkins could not legislate for every shirt-button. His advice on how big an income to aim at is very much what a modern socialist would give to his friends (II, 124 ff).

[16] Cp. E. Reynolds, *Three Treatises*, 3rd ed., London 1634, 361-3, 489; R. Sibbs, on *Corinthians*, London 1655, 124 ff, 129.

[17] Latimer, loc. cit., 221.

[18] III, 413.

[19] Works, II, *Cases of Conscience*, Bk. III, ch. IV, Qu. 1, ' How farre a man may, with good conscience, proceed in the desiring and seeking of riches ? ' M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*,, 1939, 412, thinks of Perkins as an innovator because he took for " cardinal principle " that the Gospel did not abolish natural differences of wealth. But very few except Anabaptists had ever supposed that it did.

[20] Perkins, II, 320; cp. 96 ff.

[21] II, 197. Cp. Reynolds, op. cit., 22 — The Gospel was preached to the poor " because greatnesse and abundance stops the eare, and hardens the heart, and makes men stand at defiance with the simplicity of the Gospell."

[22] Op. cit., 353.

[23] P. 43.

[24] *William Harrison*, ed. L. Withington (' Elizabethean England '), 124, 128; cp. Harman's account of the " rowsey ragged rabblement of rakehells," in E. M. Leonard, *The Early History of English Poor Relief*, 1900, 12.

[25] Perkins, *Works*, II, 145; 7 and 8 James I cap. IV.

[26] Perkins, *Works*, II, 438; cp. 452.

[27] R. M. Johnston, *The Napoleonic Empire in Southern Italy*, 1904, Vol. 1, ch. 1.

[28] Perkins, *Works*, II, 110.

[29] Ib., 468; cp. III, 90-1*. (I follow Hill in adding an asterisk to page numbers in the first 264 pages of Vol. III, before the renumbering.) Wright, op. cit. 172, points out that Perkins was influenced by Richard Greenham, who, as Knappen (op. cit., 382; cp. 344) says, " approached fanaticism in his zeal for charity." Cp. also Samuel Ward, 1595, on " a living affection to the poor, which is certeyne token of a sound Christian " (in Knappen, *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries*, 1933, 107).

[30] See especially *Works*, II, 143 ff; cp. W. Crashaw's dedicatory letter prefixed to Perkins' second treatise on ' The Calling of the Ministerie,' in *Works*, III:— " it is charity to releeve poverty, not to maintaine beggery: Poverty may be a Crosse, but it is no curse: but beggery is a fearefull curse . . . "

[31] Ib., III, 103* ff.

[32] Ib., II, 145.

[33] Harrison, loc. cit., 124.

[34] Hill, 43.

[35] P. 39.

[36] P. 33.

[37] Pp. 40-41.

[38] II, 148; cp. Sibbs, op. cit., 66.

[39] Preface to *A Christian and Plaine Treatise of . . . Predestination*, in *Works*, II.

[40] II, 99.

[41] II, 128.

[42] Hill (42) admits an " idealistic appeal " in the new approach, but he does not seem to relate it clearly to his main argument.
[43] P. 36.
[44] P. 39.
[45] III, 426.
[46] III, 583.

* * * * *

I WELCOME MR. KIERNAN'S COMMUNICATION, WHICH EMPHASIZES aspects of Perkins's thought on which I touched very lightly. I find myself more often in agreement with what Mr. Kiernan says than with the views he attacks as mine. So it may be worth explaining that I did not intend to attribute to Perkins a fully-developed " bourgeois " attitude towards the poor. After what I described as a foreshortened and schematized sketch of the old and the new attitudes, I tried to suggest ways in which Perkins contributed to a mental climate propitious to the new outlook. Of course 90% of Perkins's thought was traditional: I wished to emphasize the new 10%, the development of whose implications would have startled and shocked him.

On Perkins's theology, however, I think there is more real disagreement. Let us carefully examine that *Treatise of Predestination* which Mr. Kiernan quotes against me. Perkins hinted that a strong desire to be saved might be evidence that a man was predestined to eternal life. But he denounced the " opinion (to speak no hardlier of it) " of universal saving grace as " a plausible device of mans braine "; and utterly rejected the heresy that any man could work his own salvation.[1] Such ideas were openly defended only by Papists or Anabaptists, both beyond the pale. It is surely disingenuous (to speak no hardlier of it) for Mr. Kiernan to cite the Epistle to the Reader before the *Treatise of Predestination* as evidence of Perkins's " leaning towards an ' open-door theology '." Perkins did indeed write: " I do willingly acknowledge and teach universall redemption and grace, so far as it is possible by the word."[2] But the qualification cannot be quite so cheerfully ignored. On p. 612 Mr. Kiernan could have found the clear statement: " If those same elect be compared with them that are justly damned, wee say according to the Scriptures, that they are few." If he had read further he would have discovered that the object of the treatise was to defend orthodox Calvinism against those who wished to replace it by " an open-door theology."[3]

Perkins's concern, the same treatise shows, was not to throw heaven's gates wider open, but to reassure those serious, thoughtful, God-fearing Englishmen who were worried about the eternal decrees. " Seriously to will to beleeve," he told them, " is in very deed to

beleeve." But he had already explained that " power to wil to beleeve . . . is not common to all men," since it, like belief itself, flows from grace.[4] And I was careful to quote in my article Perkins's complaints that the mass of men were unaccountably unconcerned about their eternal state: a certain degree of education, leisure and social position, I suggested, might be necessary before men could indulge in deep thoughts about election and reprobation.

Mr. Kiernan seems to me to misconceive the audience to which Perkins's highly sophisticated and intellectual works appealed. He fails to distinguish between the really down-and-out paupers and wage-labourers (those whom even the Levellers were to exclude from the franchise) on the one hand, and poor but independent craftsmen and peasants on the other. With the social status of the latter we may indeed compare that of the poorer clergy (though not, *pace* Mr. Kiernan, university-educated divines): but not with the former. Perkins's own congregation consisted of undergraduate sons of the gentry, poor scholars raising themselves into the professional class, together with prosperous and not-so-prosperous Cambridge citizens. I do not suppose the weighty folios of his *Works* circulated widely among agricultural labourers or the depressed classes in London.

If Perkins had been asked whether men were vagabonds because unregenerate, or unregenerate because vagabonds, he would have found the question meaningless. Men were damned because of Adam's sin. But in his Bible he would read that Cain was condemned to be " a vagabond and a runnagate in the earth."[5] Given his age's horrifying literalness of interpretation, that in itself would justify Perkins's view that vagabonds are " (for the most part) a cursed generation." Damned or not, vagabonds must be restored to a disciplined community. For the very few who were destined to be saved, preaching and the sacraments were the normal means by which grace was communicated;[6] whilst it was to the glory of God, as well as convenient for the elect, that the unregenerate majority should not flout God's commandments by contumacious and socially dangerous idleness.

Balliol College, Oxford. *Christopher Hill.*

NOTES

[1] *Works*, II, p. 628.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 605.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 627-41; cf. pp. 609-10, 621-2.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 628-9.
[5] *Genesis*, 4, 12 (Geneva version).
[6] *Works*, II, p. 610.

* * * * *

Lloyd George and the Labour Movement

THE QUESTIONS ASKED LARGELY DETERMINE THE HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY that becomes current. It is therefore important, when the first assessment of a significant figure or event is being made, that care should be taken so to formulate the questions as to elicit the deepest and most complete relevance.

That the time has now come to make at least an interim judgment on Lloyd George requires no argument beyond the fact that it is 30 years since he fell from power and nearly 50 since he entered a Cabinet for the first time. But what are the questions which should be asked?

The apparently supreme question, on which the 1918 General Election was fought: "Was he 'the man who won the war'?" is too restricted for a Minister, whose terms of office comprised twelve year of peace and only four of war. In foreign policy he was no initiator: it is internally that his significance is to be sought. Did he then destroy the Liberal Party or permit its final achievement? To the historian of that Party the question is central, and the bitterness of Liberal divisions since 1916 has caused it to loom large, but it is still too limited for a complete assessment of the man. The decline of the Liberal Party is a greater phenomenon than can be explained by the personal rivalries of individuals, however important they may have been in precipitating its final phases. There is surely a strong *prima facie* case for considering that the deepest significance of Lloyd George is to be found in his relations with the Labour movement, in how he viewed and reacted to this new historical phenomenon, the rise and influence of the organised working class in the conditions of a parliamentary democracy.

Lloyd George's entry into the Cabinet coincided with the emergence of an independent Labour party in Parliament, based on the Trade Unions. His social reforms were concerned with the rising working class. He was personally engaged, to an extent never previously seen in a minister, in negotiations in connection with trade disputes. He was in office during the Great Unrest of 1910-1914, when some have believed that the country was near to social revolution,[1] during the labour disputes of the war years, which chroniclers, with their eyes on the battlefields, have been inclined to underestimate, and during the vast struggles of the immediate post-war period. For all these reasons his relations to the Labour movement seem of cardinal importance, and these notes will be chiefly concerned with them.

At his first parliamentary election (1890), he informed an enthusiastic audience that " the day of the cottage-bred man has at last dawned."[2] All his life he preserved an admiration for Lincoln,[3] whose career from log cabin to White House seems to have been an important personal inspiration. But how far was he, in fact, a man of the people? He was born the son of a schoolmaster of farming stock and when his father died, before Lloyd George was two years old, his mother arranged to bring him up in the house of his uncle, Richard Lloyd of Llanystymdwy, a small village in Caernarvonshire. The remarkable qualities of this uncle are well known. Besides his daily work he was a preacher for a Baptist group, *The Disciples of Christ*. He possessed a strong character, a fund of perseverance, a reverence for knowledge, a faith in God and in Liberalism and a confidence in the value of disputatiousness. He is often described as a cobbler, but in fact was a master shoemaker, employing from 2-5[4] men in his workshop, not rich, but certainly not poor in any comparative sense. The accounts of occasional short commons given by the later Prime Minister are not very convincing to any working-class household.[5]

The social stratification of Llanystymdwy possessed certain peculiarities. It was deeply divided into the two main sections of the English-speaking gentry (with its ties to the Church of England) and the mass of the Welsh-speaking population. In this latter, which was composed of " artisans, tradesmen, small farmers and farmworkers and the families of seamen,"[6] the Georges were near the top of the social scale[7] in a society which was only gradually crystallizing into class distinctions: by his marriage to Margaret Owen, Lloyd George was raised to the summit so far as the Welsh-speaking section was concerned.[8] But over against him was the ' English ' landed gentry, from whom he felt with his fellow-countrymen the realities of class and sectarian oppression.[9] His hostility to England would fade, but the landlord as the enemy would remain firmly fixed in the ' myth ' from which he drew emotional sustenance. It was very different with the industrial employer, oppression from whom was the major pattern in the minds of the majority of the British people and as a protest against which the Labour Movement had been born. Of the urban worker he had no direct experience. His reading, mostly narrative histories and exciting novels,[10] would be of no aid in teaching him to understand their problems from their point of view. To meet these he came to office with only two pieces of theoretical equipment: a " sympathy for the under-dog," in which some have thought to find the one flickering consistency in his career,[11] and the Joseph Chamberlain policy of " Ransom "; i.e. the belief that revolution must be headed off by timely social reform.

This "sympathy for the under-dog" reflected his youthful experience in Llanystymdwy. It would range him with the Boers in 1899 and with Belgium in 1914.[12] After a Government-Labour conference in 1912 he told C. F. G. Masterman: "There were the employers on the one hand, plump, full-fed men, well-dressed men who had never known what it was to go short in their lives. On the other side were the men, great gaunt fellows, pale with working underground, their faces all torn with anxiety and hard work," and he added: "I know which side I am on when I see that sort of thing."[13] Of the reality of the feeling there is no reason to doubt, but the extent to which it affected his action is less simply assessed. As the years passed we hear more of the high value he placed on the business executive than of his grief at working class distress.[14] The Boer War was to remain the one sympathetic gesture to a people in conflict with British Imperial power. With his other Liberal colleagues he accepted without question Grey's expediency at Denshawai.[15] His post-war Irish policy was notorious. It has not sufficiently been noted that while he rose to political significance as the opponent of Chamberlain, the 'lost leader' of Radicalism, he in fact trod the same road, gripped by the same forces. As early as 1908 Count Metternich was writing to his government: "As he thinks imperially he is also respected by the Unionists."[16] More and more he came to see all questions in terms of national power, irrespective of how that power was based and produced.

The influence of Chamberlain was the earliest and most formative in his political education, though he was never a Republican, as Chamberlain had been. In 1884 he wrote: "Mr. Chamberlain is unquestionably the future leader of the people . . . He is a Radical and doesn't care who knows it, as long as the people do."[17] When Chamberlain left Gladstone in 1886, Lloyd George hesitated[18] and then, reaching his decision, pushed forward as Chamberlain's most consistent and vehement opponent. But just as he was later moved by the same Imperial considerations, so he took over from the early Chamberlain his former Radical policy. The Limehouse speech (1909) and its corollaries are but a gloss on the doctrine of "Ransom."[19] It is, however, worth noting an important difference between the two Radicals. Chamberlain entered politics with the aid of his wealth, his business connections and his Birmingham base (something far more than a safe seat): Lloyd George was the professional politician *tout court*, with nothing to assist his rise to power except his tongue and his political sense, which included at a very early period the use of the press.[20]

It was not a rapid rise. The long continuous term of office and the long period of later opposition have tended to conceal this. He was 26 before he entered Parliament, and when in 1905 he became

a Minister (like Chamberlain without having previously held junior office) he was 42. It was at this mature age, in the ' first middle class cabinet '[21] that he proceeded to make his mark on the history of the British people.

The Government majority of 1906 was independent of the ' Irish,' but, as the defeated Balfour exultantly noted, the emergence of an independent Labour group at Westminster would mean the ultimate disappearance of the Liberal Party, which depended on the working-class vote for defeating the Conservatives.[22] It was true that nearly all the Labour members owed their election to local pacts with Liberal Associations, but the importance of the new party lay in two factors, one persistent and the other immediate. The Labour Party in the House of Commons would be a magnet for the working-class vote; the particular circumstances of the Liberal avalanche at the polls meant that any further advance in Labour representation could only be at the expense of Liberal seats. A final attempt therefore was made by the Liberal Party managers to attract the Labour members into a Lib.-Lab. association,[23] while the presence of John Burns in the Cabinet was intended to prove useful in retaining working-class support for the Liberal Party. But Burns, the vainglorious hero of the 1889 Dock Strike, had lost his hold on the working-class as he moved into the Liberal orbit, and pleased no one but himself and the Civil Servants of his ministry, whose views he so faithfully represented. From him would come no aid to the Government in the difficult problem of Liberal-Labour relations. Lloyd George's reputation had been made in the Liberal Party by his work against Balfour's Education Act, and in the Labour Movement by his courageous and unqualified oppostion to the Boer War.[24] It was he who possessed the qualities necessary to hold working-class support by the class eloquence with which he recommended social reforms on the Bismarck pattern, while he pushed the Liberal Government forward to its legislative achievement.

Liberal-Labour difficulties began early. In March 1906, Campbell-Bannerman averted an irrevocable breach only by intervening on the floor of the House of Commons against the Trades Disputes Bill of his own Law Officers. In May bad feeling was caused by the omission of any Labour representatives from the Committee on the Housing of the Working Classes. In July, Cockermouth was lost to the Liberals by the intervention of a Labour candidate, and in the following summer Pete Curran, with official Labour support, and Victor Grayson without it, won Liberal seats. In reply the Master of Elibank had no policy except petulant oratory.[25] It was Lloyd George who found the only effective answer.

The principal statement of his policy is to be found in his speech at Cardiff, October 11, 1906. His object was to persuade his own

party to go forward on the path of social reform and to persuade Labour to avoid " Socialism," to work side by side with him for limited and respectable objectives. To Labour he was reasonable and seductive: " With ordinary commonsense there ought to be no unpleasantness or misunderstanding . . . Commonsense bade them get along together as far as they could today . . . They wanted its (the Labour Party's) assistance to give direction to the policy of Liberalism and to give nerve and boldness to its attack." He coupled this wooing with a warning of the need to moderate policies: " No party could ever hope of success in this country which did not win the confidence of at least a large portion of this powerful middle class." To his own party he spoke more harshly. Only " if a Liberal Government tackle the landlords and the brewers and the peers . . . and try to deliver the nation from the pernicious control of this confederacy of monopolists " would the Independent Labour Party call in vain upon the working men of Britain to desert Liberalism." It was a bold bid for a centre political grouping, which would harness much of the working class vote and retain enough of middle class support to outweigh the Conservatives. It is a sign of Lloyd George's mature political sense that he did not over-value the majority of 1906, but based his estimate of needs on a sober analysis of the balance of social forces. Perhaps he recognised that a parliamentary party of the Liberals' social composition[26] would not find it easy to retain working-class support without special efforts.

On the social reform programme this is not the place to make a detailed judgment. It was not the product of Lloyd George's brain: systematic detailed thought was never his characteristic. The preconceptions of the Welfare State are due to others. There is, however, much truth in the precise, considered opinion of Tom Jones: " In effect what he did was to spike the Socialist guns with essentially Conservative social measures derived from the Liberal arsenal."[27] At the time the reforms looked immense, partly because reform had been so small in the last twenty years and even more because of the demagogic oratory of Lloyd George, which one is sometimes inclined to feel increased in violence and revolutionary phraseology in inverse proportion to the benefits bestowed.

1910 marks a turning-point in Lloyd George's career. In the January election of that year the Liberals lost heavily, in spite of the social reform record and the formidable rallying-cry of Peers vs. People. The losses convinced him that his attempt to hold the working-class vote for the Liberal Party had failed. Within a few months he was striving with remarkable openness for a Liberal-Conservative coalition, the essence of which was to be a settlement of outstanding problems by the two parties on a give-and-take basis in the interests of national security.[28] From that moment, in spite

of the resumption of party warfare after the failure of the attempt, Lloyd George ceased to be a Radical, as had Chamberlain before him.

But the Labour problem was not only electoral. The emergence of large scale concerns and associations of employers on the one hand, and of largely supported and closely organised Trade Unions on the other, gave a different character to trade disputes. They now more and more threatened to dislocate the life of the whole community and to affect national security. The Government intervened to an increasing extent in these conflicts and to Lloyd George, as President of the Board of Trade from 1905-8, (and subsequently in other offices, because of his record of successful settlement) it fell to represent the Government in a number of important negotiations.

Though the pattern of State intervention in Labour disputes had been lightly sketched by reformers and Fabians from the early 1890's — Rosebery's action in the Miners' dispute of 1893 had established an important precedent — it fell to Lloyd George to fill in its details. Intervention by ' outsiders ' in Labour disputes was no novelty. Cardinal Manning's activities in the London dock strike of 1889 were a prominent example. But when the Government intervenes a special factor is interjected, of the utmost importance. For when the Government negotiates it has at its ultimate disposal the coercive power of the State. Thus in 1911 the Liberal Government considered the use of troops to break the London Dock strike; it considered the use of troops to break the Railway strike; it moved warships and troops to Liverpool. From the use of troops in 1911 Lloyd George recoiled, but when in 1919 he was faced with the threat of a Miners' strike, he induced the men's leaders to call off their proposed action by the threat of force combined with the offer of a Royal Commission, whose recommendations would be binding on the government, and it was the threat of force which was decisive.[29] This is the special factor which Government intervention in trade disputes introduces. Moreover, the State has a bias in favour of the *status quo*, and it is against this background that Lloyd George's significance is to be seen.[30]

We must repeat. Lloyd George was no revolutionary. He was — and this is important — ready to use revolutionary phrases, especially against the landed aristocracy against whom his resentment was genuine and lasting. Hence his radicalism could at times carry conviction among politically conscious workers, all the more so since the hostility he aroused, and sometimes deliberately provoked, among the die-hards was also obviously genuine, and since in his early days he avoided too much contact with " Society."[31] Politicians of the older type could and did secure social reforms, but we may doubt whether a Lord Randolph or a Winston Churchill could have

played the part which came so naturally to the provincial solicitor, though both tried to do so. Hence Lenin's well-known admiration for him, expressed in the dedication to his " Left Wing Communism."[32] Lloyd George simply stood for a policy of reform and of concession by the employing classes to meet the demands of labour to the extent necessary to avoid social upheaval and to preserve national power.

It is not possible to discover any consistent policy underlying his settlements of industrial disputes except this. He had no theory of the just rights of Capital and Labour. To have his policy accepted, he had both to persuade the employing classes of the need for concession and the employed, that the concessions made in fact approached their demands (though he was sometimes tempted to forget the difference between charming leaders round the conference table into agreement, and persuading the rank-and-file that they got something out of the affair). In this task revolutionary class oratory, frightening to employers, consoling and diversionary to their workers, played a decisive role[33] while the device of separate negotiation with workers and employers assisted in the moment of acute dispute. The " Times " was wrong when it wrote of the Great Unrest: " This spirit has been distinctly fostered by the conspicuous incitements to class hatred uttered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his electioneering campaigns " (August 19, 1911). Lloyd George was astute when he sandwiched attacks on the House of Lords and friendly references to Socialism between bouts of negotiating the railway settlement of 1907.[34] He realised that in a democracy Labour could be neutralised only by a Government which appeared to be completely on its side in the recurrent conflicts between Capital and Labour. This policy of managed concession served him well up to the outbreak of the 1914 war.

During the war years the policy of concessions was largely one of promises for later payment, but here begins to appear the other part of Lloyd George's policy, the coupling of coercion with concession, employed discriminately according to an assessment of the seriousness of the threat to the foundations of society. It was this dual policy which in Lloyd George's hands brought Britain through the period of his office without far more social disturbance than actually occurred.[35]

This flexibility[36] which depends upon reliable State power and a margin for concession, remains as the signal contribution of Lloyd George to the history of the British people. To use the policy successfully a man is required who can command the confidence of the democracy. By 1922, when the Chanak affair was used to drive him from office, Lloyd George had ceased to be such a man. Labour no longer had faith in him: to the Conservatives he had therefore

lost his value. His oratory was stale and his promises unconvincing. His financial transactions had left an unpleasant taint from which he would never afterwards escape. His career, in spite of a few spectacular attempts and interventions, was now finished. The writing of his War Memoirs and his growing inclination, when he spoke in Parliament, to speak on Foreign Affairs, has diverted attention from his domestic record, but as the years arrange themselves in perspective it will surely be accepted that, whether in the years of peace or war, it was his genius which played an important and perhaps decisive part in preventing the emergence of a revolutionary socialist movement, by a careful assessment of the facts and the use of coercion and concession according to the needs of the situation. This from any point of view is a major contribution to a people's history

London. *W. S. Adams.*

NOTES

[1] Lloyd George at a meeting in the City of London (17-7-1914), referred to the coincidence of the Labour " insurrection " with the Irish crisis as producing a situation which would be " the gravest with which any Government has had to deal with for centuries." See Halévy, *History of the English People*: Epilogue vol ii, 478. Lord Askwith, *Industrial Problems and Disputes*, 353-356 also emphasises the dangers of the situation. Whether revolution was near before 1914 must remain a matter of opinion. Revolution did not in fact occur and no accurate historical apparatus exists for such assessments. My personal view is that there appears to be some evidence of the development of a revolutionary situation, e.g. Askwith, *Address to Cavendish Club*, Bristol, Nov. 1913 (*op. cit.* 348 ff; see also 200 ff on the Coal strike of 1912) and Lenin, *The British Labour Movement in* 1912 (Coll. Works vol. xvi), but that in the absence of a national co-ordinating leadership, such as Lenin and his party provided in Russia, the Government was in no serious danger of being unable to control the disturbances.

[2] W. Watkin Davies, *Lloyd George*, 1863-1914, 84.

[3] Thomas Jones, *Lloyd George*, 205.

[4] H. Du Parcq, *David Lloyd George* (1912), 14, says " two or three." E. T. Raymond, Mr. Lloyd George, 9 " generally one or two," Jones, *op. cit.*, 2, "two." Davies, *op. cit.* states that on the death of David, Richard Lloyd's father, " the actual work of bootmaking was performed by the servants " until Richard grew up and p. 12 refers to the " cobbler and his two men," but Lloyd George's son, Viscount Gwynned, in *Dame Margaret*; *The Life Story of his Mother*, 74, says " five."

[5] Malcolm Thomson, *David Lloyd George*, 49. " There came indeed a time after the grandmother died, when money ran low and the family were very near poverty." Davies, *op, cit.* 14 " It was of this period of greatest stress that Mr. Lloyd George was probably thinking when he wrote in an article many years later: ' Our bread was home-made, we scarcely ate fresh meat and I remember that our greatest luxury was half-an-egg for each child on Sunday morning ' " and p. 13 " The legend that Mr. Lloyd George was reared in abject poverty, is a gross travesty of the truth."

[6] Thomson *op. cit.* 44.

[7] The Georges were the " only village boys who wore knickerbockers." Raymond, *op. cit.* 15 quoting Hugh Edwards, *D. Lloyd George.*

[8] The Owens, who claimed descent from Owen Glendower, objected to the engagement on social grounds. Thomson *op. cit.* 79.

[9] He had seen and remembered the eviction of Liberal voters in 1868. Thomson *op. cit.* 55. C. F. G. Masterman noted years later that " the only insults Lloyd George resents are the insults of class arrogance." Lucy B. Masterman, *C. F. G. Masterman*, 150.

[10] Lord Riddell, *War Diary* for Jan. 6th, 1918, " Ll.G.: I like a good bloodthirsty novel with plenty of fighting and plenty of killing. I love Robert Louis Stevenson and Antony Hope and I don't care for George Eliot. I like Scott, but he is too long in coming to the point." For his historical reading, see Thomson *op. cit.* 50. Other biographers are in general agreement.

[11] Jones, *op. cit.* 279.

[12] In view of his hesitation, the *casus belli* of Belgium must have come as a relief. Morley, *Memorandum on Resignation*, 14, 20, 23; also A. C. Murray, *Master and Brother*, 12.

[13] Masterman, *op. cit.* 234.

[14] Lord Riddell's Intimate *Diary of the Peace Conference and After*, 918-23, for March 27, 1920. " I notice that L.G. is steadily veering over to the Tory point of view. He constantly refers to the great services rendered by captains of industry and defends the propriety of the large share of profits they take. He says one Leverhulme and Ellerman is worth more to the world than say 100,000 sea-captains or 20,000 engine drivers and should be rewarded accordingly. He wants to improve the world and the condition of the people but wants to do it in his own way."

[15] My *Edwardian Heritage*, 173-77 contains an analysis, based on Cd 3086 of 1906, Correspondence respecting the attack on British Officers at Denshawai. The sentences were not related to the facts of this Egyptian incident, but to the expediency of maintaining British prestige. See *The Times* 28-6-1906 and Grey in the Commons, July 5.

[16] July 16. Quoted by Lloyd George in his *War Memoirs*, vol. i, 14. Cf. Lord Esher, *Journal*, vol. ii for Feb. 12, 1908: " He is . . . an Imperialist at heart if he is anything."

[17] Thomson, *op. cit.* 73.

[18] *ibid.*, 74.

[19] E.g.: " Won't you give something towards keeping them out of the workhouse? They scowl at us and we say: ' Only a ha'penny, just a copper.' They say ' You're thieves' and they turn their dogs on us and you can hear their barks every morning. If this is an indication of the view taken by those great landlords of their responsibility to the people who at the risk of their life create their wealth, then I say their day of reckoning is at hand."

[20] Thomson, *op. cit.* 80. " In the very month of his wedding he joined with Dr. Daniel, a keen young local Welsh nationalist, to found in Pwllheli, a local Welsh journal *Udgorn Rhydd* (Trumpet of Freedom), the first of several newspapers initiated by him . . . "

[21] This somewhat startling but exact description was Morley's. Sir F. Maurice, *R. B. Haldane*, vol. i, 167.

[22] Jan. 17, 1906, letter to Austen Chamberlain, Text in Sir C. Petrie, *Life and Letters of Sir Austen Chamberlain*, vol. i, 176.

[23] J. R. Clynes, *My Memoirs*, vol. i, 111.

[24] His friends noted that it had aged him, Davies *op. cit.* 195. It ruined his practice and when he entered the Cabinet he had an overdraft of £400. Riddell *op. cit.* for 31-12-1918. At least once, Birmingham Town Hall meeting Dec. 18, 1901, he risked his life. Cf. Murray, *op. cit.* 120 quoting Walter Runciman: " I remember him (L.G.) saying (August 1914) that he had enough of ' standing out against a war inflamed populace '."

[25] He was Chief Liberal Whip. " The Socialist Party was very powerful. They had opened war on the Liberal Party and he was not very certain that it might not be necessary in the future for the Liberal Party to embark on another crusade." Liberal Magazine, April 1906.

[26] See J. A. Thomas, *The British House of Commons* 1832-1901.

[27] Jones, *op. cit.* 34.

[28] Thomson *op. cit.* 193-5 for his important memorandum on this.

[29] Beatrice Webb, *Diaries* 1912-24, 147. R. Smillie, the miners' leader, is reported to have told his friends: " If there is a strike they will use the soldiers. My people will be shot down. Anything rather than that." A. Hutt, *Post-War History of the British Working Class*, 21.

[30] One of the points on which more research is needed is on the pattern of the use of the State coercive machinery. Has it ever been used in this country to compel employers to make concessions? There appears to be no equivalent for the employers of the threat to the workers that, if they persist in a strike, the police and/or the armed forces will be used to make their struggle abortive.

[31] Riddell, *op. cit.* for Dec. 5, 1912 " L.G. said ' I rarely accept private dinner invitations but make one exception — Lady St. Helier who has always been a good friend of mine. I prefer to live with my own little circle of friends. I like a cut of mutton and good bright company."

[32] Lenin's comment on Lloyd George is worth quoting. (Text in *Lenin on Britain*, 147.) It was written in 1916: " A first-class bourgeois businessman and master of political cunning, a popular orator, able to make any kind of speech, even r-r-revolutionary speeches before Labour audiences, capable of securing fairly considerable sops for the obedient workers in the shape of social reforms (insurance etc.), Lloyd George serves the bourgeoisie splendidly. He serves it precisely among the workers, he transmits his influence to the proletariat, where it is most necessary and most difficult morally to subjugate the masses." Again: " It would not do to dispense with elections in our age; the masses cannot be dispensed with and in this epoch of the printing press and parliamentarism it is *impossible* to make the masses follow without a widely ramified systematically managed well-equipped system of flattery, lies and fraud, without juggling with fashionable and popular catch-words, scattering promises right and left of all kinds of reforms and blessing for the workers, if only they will give up revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. I would call this system Lloyd-Georgeism after the name of the most prominent and dexterous representative of this system."

[33] Contrast e.g. Lloyd George and Asquith during the railway dispute of 1911. Asquith by his uncompromising language to the men's leaders: " then your blood be on your own head " made Government conciliation impossible, August 17, and the situation was saved only by Lloyd George's Commons statement the same evening putting a conciliatory gloss on the Premier's offer of a Royal Commission.

[34] E.g. his speech at Madeley, Nov. 1, 1907: " There was a certain advantage in Socialism in that it stirred people up to think. The real importance of Socialism was not the demand it made but the grievances which gave rise to it. That was what was really at the bottom of the unrest and unless we dealt with it he did not know what might happen, but it would not be the fault of Socialism . . . " He had first intervened in the dispute on Oct. 19. It was settled on Nov. 6.

[35] A good example of this flexibility in Riddell, *op. cit.* for Oct. 5, 1919. The reference is to the railway strike of that autumn. " I told the leaders: ' If there is fighting, it will put the things you and I care for back for years. The nation will turn reactionary . . . That impressed them very much . . . The railwaymen have agreed not to strike until September, 1920. That breaks up the Triple Alliance. The strike came too soon for the colliers and the transport workers. They were not ready. Now we have detached the railwaymen. I think the result of the strike will have a most salutary influence." See also entry for Oct. 11. " L.G. told me that he had stood alone in urging a settlement. All those acting with him were anxious to defeat and punish the strikers."

PAST AND PRESENT

WILL APPEAR TWICE A YEAR IN

FEBRUARY AND NOVEMBER

Contributors to future issues will include :

H. TAKAHASHI (Tokyo)	*Japanese Feudalism*
G. BARRACLOUGH (Liverpool)	*Reflections on Ranke*
E. KOSMINSKY (Moscow)	*Forms of Feudal Rent in England*
B. SMALLEY (Oxford)	*Thomas Aquinas*
W. G. HOSKINS (Oxford)	*The Rebuilding of Rural England*
J. V. POLISENSKY (Prague)	*The Thirty Years War*
G. LEFEBVRE (Paris)	*The Holy Alliance*

Other projected articles will discuss *The Beginnings of Feudalism in Central Europe*, *The Absolute Monarchy in France*, *Seventeenth Century Sweden and Nineteenth Century Ireland* and will include contributions from Australian and American historians.

MSS for publication and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor of PAST AND PRESENT, *John Morris, at University College, Gower Street, London, W.C.*1.

Subscriptions, requests for advertising space, and business correspondence should be sent to the Business Manager, PAST AND PRESENT, c/o Titus Wilson & Son, Ltd., 28 Highgate, Kendal, Westmorland.

The price of PAST AND PRESENT *is* 15/- ($ 2.50) *per annum, by pre-paid subscription, or* 9/- *per single copy, obtainable from the Business Manager.*

HEFFER'S

A CAMBRIDGE BOOKSHOP THAT IS KNOWN IN ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD.
Petty Cury, Cambridge

IUB

94
Gower Street,
London, W.C.1

The following Catalogues and Lists available on request :—

Cat.
53 Mediæval and Modern History
54 Theology and Philosopy
55 French Language and Literature

List
431 Politics and Economics
436 Classical Antiquity
437 Education & Psychology

●

International University Booksellers
LTD.

BOOKS *on the Pure and Applied Sciences always in stock*

CATALOGUES ON REQUEST PLEASE STATE INTERESTS

SECOND-HAND DEPARTMENT: 23, GOWER PLACE, W.C.1.
A constantly changing large stock of scientific books on view. Rare and out-of-print books sought for and reported free of charge.

SCIENTIFIC LENDING LIBRARY
ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION FROM TWENTY-FIVE SHILLINGS
Prospectus post free on application

Bi-monthly List of New Books and New Editions sent post free to all Subscribers regularly.

THE LIBRARY CATALOGUE revised to December, 1949.
To subscribers **17s. 6d.** net. To non-subscribers **35s.** net., postage **1s. 3d.**
Supplement 1950-52 in preparation.

London : **H. K. LEWIS & Co. Ltd.**
136, GOWER STREET, LONDON, W.C.1. Telephone: EUSTON 4282

REPRINTED IN BELGIUM